National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XV. NO. 48. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1855. WHOLE NO. 776.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY (ON SATURDAY),
At $2 per annum,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
31 North Fifth St., Philadelphia.

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Selections.

☞ We [*Newport (Ky.) News*] have just received the following from our friend, Rev. John G. Fee, of Berea, Madison Co., Ky., justifying himself against false accusations, &c., as will be seen in his communication.

It is gratifying to see that the *News* is sought for by all parties and sects to obtain a hearing when refused by editors filled with prejudice, and who, for the want of the proper Christian spirit (the true spirit of Democracy) are ready to muzzle their press, and cut off FREE DISCUSSION, for fear their readers are fools and cannot judge of the truths or errors of the day. Such editors assume a great deal of wisdom for themselves and grant a very small portion of it to their readers. It is admitted by all that he that will not reason is a bigot, and he that dare not is a slave; but he that cannot, all will agree, should be pitied. Hear all sides, then decide, say we.

For the Newport News.

FRIEND BAILEY: Some weeks since, the editor of the *Louisville Courier* noticed the fact that there are in Kentucky some twenty churches having no fellowship with slaveholders. In his first article, he expressed a desire to know something more concerning these churches; then made some strictures upon them, referring to myself personally. Of course, you would expect an editor, after making attacks upon associations of his native-born fellow-citizens, would have the manliness to publish respectful replies. This he had not. In his second, he represented me as boasting that I, in common with others, was engaged in distributing anti-slavery documents to slaves. I assured him this was false. He replied by saying when I corrected this among Northern friends, then it would be time to correct it here. The report, as officially reported by the Secretary of the American Missionary Association, is as follows: "Our colporteurs in Kentucky are engaged in distributing Bibles to slaves and others, and religious and anti-slavery publications to the whites, and are, for the most part, well received." This is all that is said on the subject. It is *not* true that we distribute anti-slavery documents to slaves.

For a time I thought to let the report go; but recently, in my labours in adjoining counties, I find his report is being used to my prejudice.

Knowing that your columns are open to "free speech," I send my replies to your paper. I may be able thus, to some limited extent, to counteract the effect of his articles.

Yours, respectfully, J. G. FEE.
Berea, Madison Co., Ky., March 8, '55.

For the Newport News.

"ABOLITION CHURCHES IN KENTUCKY."

NO. I.

Editor of the Louisville Courier:

Under the above caption, in your paper, I see an extract, from some other paper, announcing the fact that there are in Kentucky "twenty anti-slavery churches"—twelve under care of United Brethren, eight independent.

Accompanying this extract is an editorial making strictures upon the position of these free churches, and also expressing a desire "to get some light on the subject."

Twelve of these churches are under the care of the United Brethren in Christ, eight are independent. With the latter I am associated, and willingly give to you and your readers all the information I suppose to be necessary, and, at the same time, a reply to the strictures made upon our position. This is a constitutional privilege, and one which should be as popular as it is constitutional.

The writer of the extract alluded to is mistaken in supposing that I am a Presbyterian clergyman. I was, for many years, a member of the Presbyterian church (N. S.), ordained by Harmony Presbytery, at Midway church, Woodford Co., Ky., laboured two years in the ministry, remonstrating with the Presbytery and Synod against the sin of slavery. I became convinced that it was wrong for me to remain in fellowship with those who deliberately persisted in what I understood, in the light of the Bible, to be a flagrant sin, and especially when repentance was affirmed by the Presbytery to be hopeless.

We reject sectarian names and tenets. We believe the Bible requires that with *purity* there should be *unity*. But to reply:

1. You say, "where Mr. Fee gets his authority for such organizations, we do not know." I think this very probable, and that your want of knowledge renders you very unfit to make strictures upon others. We get authority from Scripture like the following: "Now I have written unto you not to keep company if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an *extortioner:* with such a one no not to eat" (1 Cor. v.: 11). That slaveholding is the worst form of extortion, all are bound to know. It extorts from the poor enslaved man not only the proceeds of his labour, the wife of his bosom, the child of his body, the right to worship God *where* and *when* he pleases, but the very right to *himself*—the right in which all others inhere—and thus violates the law of God, which says, "Thou shalt not covet *anything* that is thy neighbour's." Personal ownership is one of the things that belong to that neighbour, or fellow-man, as the word imports.

Again, Paul says, "The law is made for murderers of fathers and mothers, for whoremongers, for *men-stealers*, and for any other that is contrary to the glorious gospel of the blessed Lord" (1 Tim.: 1—10. The law here referred to is the law of God, revealed in the Bible. This law, like correct human law, comes not to invest rights (natural), but to protect those already invested—existing. Among other rights existing prior to the coming of law was that of personal ownership. The depriving of this right is the sin of man-stealing. The Greek word employed by the inspired writer is specifically expressive of this fact. Also, when Joseph was deprived of personal ownership, he said, "I indeed was stolen away from the land of the Hebrews." It was the sin which, under the Mosaic economy, was punished with death (Exodus xxi. : 16). Under the Gospel dispensation, as in the text under consideration, the crime is one which exposes the perpetrator to eternal death, and places him along with the most flagitious of mortals. In this view, Dr. Clark, Wesley, Edwards, Grotius and others concur.

Now, the law being made for such transgressors, in every well-organized church the law will be *enforced*, and the unrepentant transgressor excluded.

Again, "withdraw yourself from every brother that walketh disorderly" (2 Thes., iii. : 6). If I should deprive the editor of the *Courier* of his horse, or his library, he would doubtless regard such conduct disorderly walking. Should I go further, and deprive him of his wife, his child, and then of the ownership of *himself*, he would doubtless regard such an act as disorderly walking—a violation of that Gospel order which requires us "not to seek our own, but another's good"—to love our *neighbour as ourselves*—to do unto men as we would they should *do unto us*.

No ordinary slaveholding can exist without a violation of this last command, and also of that which says, "Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbour's," and the transgression of the law is sin.

Now, God designs not that this church should contain those who are known deliberate transgressors (sinners), but those who are righteous.

In the light of such texts, it will not "puzzle Mr. Fee to tell what Christianity has to do with such churches" as those having no fellowship with slaveholders.

Properly applied, Christianity has nothing to do with any other churches. If Christianity may sanction the violation of God's law in the case of the slaveholder, it may in the case of the gambler, the drunkard, the adulterer, and the murderer, and thus the doors of the church be thrown open to the reception of *every sin*, and the distinction between the church and the world broken down.

Our policy, then, instead of being one injurious to Christianity, is the only one faithful to it, because it is the one God enjoins. The pro-slavery policy you would defend is the mingling of Christ and Belial—righteousness and unrighteousness.

JOHN G. FEE.

For The Louisville Courier.

"ABOLITION CHURCHES IN KENTUCKY."

NO. II.

MR. EDITOR: In your article under the above caption, you assume that our free chuches are based upon one of the political parties of the land. This is an assumption without proof—an assumption based upon the single fact that we treat slaveholding as we do other acts, we regard, in the light of God's word, as sinful. As well might you call our churches political churches because they exclude the drunkard, the gambler, the fornicator. For the same reason you should call all other churches political churches which exclude the drunkard, the gambler, the swearer, the adulterer. And you call these political churches, because, in their attempt to inculcate, thus far, sound morality, and pure religion, they oppose those things about which politicians have passed laws.

1. By the editor's own confessions, slavery is a political relation. *He takes this into his church*, then complains of us that we *do not*. If anybody dabbles in politics, it is the editor, and not us.

2. The correct position, as we suppose, is this, some questions are both *moral* and political. When questions, as banks and tariffs, are merely political, then, as church members, so far as discipline is concerned, we have nothing to do with such. As citizens, we have. But when questions are not only political, but also and preëminently of a *moral character*, then the church has something to do with such. This prepares us to notice the absurdity of the editor's position.

3. Legitimately and plainly expressed, it is this. We should not, in a church capacity, speak about, or act against anything, about which politicians have passed laws? Then, because politicians have passed laws about drunkenness, then, as churches, we must let the drunkard remain in fellowship and unrebuked. So with the swearer, so with the murderer, and thus the mouth of the church would be sealed in reference to the whole table of the moral law; all discipline would be destroyed—the difference between the church and the world would be broken down, or rather the church would be lower in its moral discipline than the world.

Tolerate one sin and you may tolerate every other sin under Heaven. Where would be the utility of such a church? The Devil would be its God, idolaters, drunkards, swearers, slaveholders, adulterers and murderers its ministers. This would be the legitimate effect of the policy pursued by the *Louisville Courier*.

A pure church is the light of the world, leading in the path of virtue and to happiness—the world's richest blessing. But a corrupt church enshrouds the world in moral darkness, leads to vice and wretchedness—a curse of curses. And if there be an enemy to God and man, however honestly mistaken, it is that man who prostitutes the church, God's guardian of virtue and purity, to the sanction of vice—of sin. That slaveholding is sin, every man knows, in reference to himself, his wife, his child. That it is sinful towards all other men not criminals, law-abiding men, may be seen in the light of Christ, that golden rule which requires that we "do unto men as we would *men* should do unto us."

In my next, I notice the epistle to Philemon.

JOHN G. FEE.

To the Louisville Courier.

NO. III.

MR. EDITOR: In your first article, in reference to our free churches, you ask, "Do the free churches associated with Mr. Fee tear out or skip Paul's letter to Philemon?"

Doubtless the editor is not serious in asking this question. He does not suppose that associations of Christians, in this land of free expose, would be guilty of such an outrage.

We use the Bible commonly used by Protestant Christians, and, in our defence of human liberty, we love to refer to Paul's letter to Philemon.

The editor assumes that Philemon was a slaveholder, and, as such, a member of the church of Christ—and that Onesimus was returned to Philemon as a slave.

Here, again, is assumption without proof. And the assumption is the more gross from the fact that the epistle itself bears evidence that Onesimus was not a slave, and that, had he even been one, the requirement of the Apostle is such that Philemon, if obedient, would have at once released Onesimus—freed him. Concerning the case, we remark:

1. The benefit, spoken of in verse 14th, can be accounted for as readily on the ground that Onesimus was simply a hireling, or a bound person, as a slave.

2. The fact that the Apostle expresses a doubt (verse 18) as to whether Onesimus owed Philemon anything, is proof that he was not a slave. In the eye of slave law, slaves are chattels, things, and incapable of legally *owing* anything to their masters.

If it be assumed that Onesimus was the rightful property of Philemon, and as a slave owed his person to Philemon, then Paul must have known it, and would not have expressed a doubt.

3. The plain teaching of the epistle is, that Onesimus was the actual brother "*in the flesh*" to Philemon—children of the same parents. Paul says explicitly that Onesimus was "a brother beloved, especially to me, but how much more unto thee, both *in the flesh* and in the Lord." See verse 16. It was customary, in that age of the world, for the younger brother to be in a bond service to the elder.

It must be clear to every mind, that there was some reason why Onesimus was more beloved to Philemon than to Paul. It could not have been on the ground of slavery, for there is not much love in robbing a man of his liberty—his dearest rights. It could not have been on the ground of mere special favours to Philemon, for one who had had such, for surely the favours bestowed by Onesimus upon Paul were under such circumstances as to elicit the highest affection, unless by *blood relationship*. No other is a sufficient or reasonable way of accounting for the language of the epistle; especially beloved to Philemon, "both in the *flesh* and in the Lord."

4. If it be still claimed that the word servant means a slave, as pro-slavery men claim, then, substituting the definition they give for the word itself, the verse will read as follows: "Not now a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved." History sustains the fact that he was afterwards a free man. In the epistle to the Colossians he is represented as a messenger to the church in that place. Again, Ignatius, writing concerning him, praises God that the church at Ephesus had so good a bishop." See Milner's Church history. If, then, as pro-slavery men claim, Onesimus had been held as a slave, the apostle emancipated him *immediately, and that, too, upon the soil*." The strongest Abolitionist could do no more.

After this positive evidence, let us look at the improbabilities that Onesimus was a slave.

1. Had he been a slave, would he, whilst in Rome, have sought an interview with Paul, knowing him, as pro-slavery men represent him, as a pro-slavery preacher breaking down the property of slaveholders. Would any of our fugitives in Ohio hunt up such Kentucky preachers as are of the above stripe? Even attend their preaching?

2. If Onesimus had wanted to run from slavery into freedom, would he run about one thousand miles through a region where slaveholders travelled, and right into the very capital of a slaveholding country, Rome, the worst slave mart then in the world, when, in a short time, he could have crossed over into Phrygia or India, which were free States?

If any of our slaves, near the Ohio river, wanted to escape into freedom, would they travel a thousand miles right through slaveholding States to Charleston or New Orleans? Would they take this course and go to these places if they were slaves running for freedom?

The position bears upon its face a palpable absurdity, and, as we have previously shown, is contradicted by positive facts.

I hope the editor of the *Courier* will not again attempt a Bible defence of slavery. If he does, I hope he will have magnanimity to open his columns for free speech.

I hope he is also satisfied that we do not skip over the Epistle to Philemon. JOHN G. FEE.

THE BURNS RIOT.

THE INDICTMENTS ALL QUASHED.

We give below the decision of Judge Curtis, concurred in by Judge Sprague, by which Mr. Hallett's indictments are all *quashed:*

CURTIS J. The Grand Jury, at the present term, returned into Court an indictment against Martin Stowell for obstructing the Marshal of this district in serving legal progress. The indictment is framed under the twenty-fifth section of the act of April 30, 1790.

The accused, having been arraigned, submitted, through his counsel, a motion to quash the indictment. It is within the discretion of the Court to refuse to entertain such a motion and put the party to plead in abatement, or to demur, in order to raise questions affecting the regularity of the finding of the indictment, or its formal or substantial sufficiency. In this case, the Court, being satisfied, on the presentation of the motion, and looking into the indictment, that some of the causes assigned therein were proper to be discussed and decided in this form of proceeding, have, for the sake of convenience, allowed the counsel to present their views on all the questions which, in their apprehension, it was proper to make; not intending, however, to depart from what we consider to be a sound rule, that questions admitting of doubt, and involving such difficulty as to require a protracted and elaborate examination, should not be decided in this form of proceeding, especially when the motion is not made till the jurors and witnesses are in attendance for the trial. Having given to some of the questions raised that consideration we have found necessary to a decision, I will now state the opinion of the Court thereon.

The indictment contains five counts. The first is the most full and particular, and an examination of that will render any extended observations on the others unnecessary.

The count alleges, in substance, that the defendant knowingly and wilfully did obstruct, resist and oppose the Marshal of this district in serving and attempting to serve a certain warrant and order which are set out in the count. The clause of the 25th section of the act of 1790, on which this indictment depends, makes it an offence knowingly and wilfully to obstruct, resist or oppose any officer of the United States in serving or attempting to serve, or execute, any legal process whatever.

To constitute an offence under this law, therefore, the obstruction must have been of legal process; and whatever may have been the form or purpose of the process, it is not legal process, within the meaning of this act, unless it emanated from, and was issued by, some tribunal, Judge or Magistrate authorized by the laws of the United States to issue such process.

It is clear, also, that the indictment must show, by proper averments, that the process was legal, not only in form and purpose, but as emanating from some court or officer empowered by law to issue such process.

What particular averments are necessary to show this authority to issue the process alleged to be obstructed depends upon the character of the tribunal, or officer, from whom it came. If, as in this case, the officer who granted the process had by law only a limited and special authority, dependent for its existence upon particular facts, every fact necessary to the existence of that authority must either be averred in the indictment or appear on the face of the process set out therein. Whether it be sufficient that some of the facts necessary to the existence of power to issue the process, where the jurisdiction is special and limited, appear upon the face of the process itself set out in the indictment, but are not averred in the indictment to be true, so as to be traversed and put in issue by a plea of not guilty, it is not necessary in this case to decide. See Wise vs. Withers, 5 Cranch; Elliott and al. vs. Hiersol, 1 Peters, 340; Allen vs. Gray, 11 Con. R., 95; Savol vs. Broughton, 5 Wenc., 170, which contains an elaborate review of the cases; and People against Warren, 5 Hill's R., 440; 1 Russ on Crimes, 511; Foster, 311, 312; 1 Hale's P. C., 460.

It will be seen, when we come to examine the indictment, that the defect which we think exists in the averments to show authority to issue the warrant is not aided, so far as the act of 1790 is concerned, by anything on the face of the warrant itself.

The first count alleges that "heretofore, to wit, on the twenty-fourth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four, *a certain warrant and legal process* directed to the Marshal of the said District of Massachusetts, or either of his Deputies, *was duly issued under the hand and seal of Edward G. Loring, Esquire, who was then and there a Commissioner of the Circuit Court of the United States, for said District*, which said warrant and legal process was duly delivered to Watson Freeman, Esquire, who was then and there an officer of the United States, for the said District of Massachusetts, at Boston, in the District aforesaid, on the said twenty-fourth day of May, in the year aforesaid, and was of the purport and effect following, that is to say:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

"MASSACHUSETTS DISTRICT, SS.

"To the Marshal of our District of Massachusetts or either of his Deputies, Greeting:

"In the name of the President of the United States of America, you are hereby commanded forthwith to apprehend Anthony Burns, a negro man, alleged now to be in your district, *charged with being a fugitive from labour, and with having escaped from service in the State of Virginia*, if he may be found in your precincts, and have him forthwith before me, Edward G. Loring, one of the Commissioners of the Circuit Court of the United States for the said District, then and there to answer to the complaint of Charles F. Suttle, of Alexandria, in the State of Virginia, Merchant, 'alleging under oath that the said Anthony Burns, on the twenty-fourth day of March last, did and for a long time prior thereto had owed service and labour to him, the said Suttle, in the said State of Virginia, under the laws thereof; and that while held to service there by said Suttle, the said Burns escaped from the said State of Virginia, into the said State of Massachusetts: and that the said Burns still owes service and labour to said Suttle, in the said State of Virginia,' and praying that the said Burns may be restored to him, said Suttle, in said State of Virginia, and that such further proceedings may then and there be had in the premises as are by law in such case provided.

"Hereof fail not, and make due return of this writ, with your doings therein before me.

"Witness my hand and seal, at Boston, aforesaid, this twenty-fourth day of May, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four.

"EDWARD G. LORING,
"Commisioner. [L. S.]"

These are the only parts of the first count material to the present inquiry, which is not whether it could be proved, on the trial, that Mr. Loring had authority to issue this warrant, but whether these averments are sufficient, in point of law, to show to the Court that he had that authority.

The first section of the act of Congress of September 15, 1850, taken in connection with the sixth section of the same act, confers power to issue warrants to arrest fugitives from service upon "the persons who have been, or may hereafter be, appointed Commissioners, in virtue of any act of Congress, by the Circuit Courts of the United States, and who, in consequence of such appointment, are authorized to exercise the powers that any justice of the peace or other magistrate of any of the United States may exercise, in respect to offenders for any crime or offence against the United States, by arresting, imprisoning, or bailing the same, under and by virtue of the thirty-third section of the act of the twenty-fourth of September, seventeen hundred and eighty-nine, entitled 'an act to establish the judicial courts of the United States'"

It appears, then, that to have authority to issue a warrant under this act of 1850, the person issuing it must not only be a Commissioner appointed by the Circuit Court of the United States, but a Commissioner thus appointed on whom have been conferred the powers respecting the arrest, imprisonment and bail of the offenders, which were conferred on justices of the peace by the thirty-third section of the act of 1789. That is, he must be *such* a Commissioner as is particularly described by the act of 1850.

Does the averment, that the person who issued this warrant was "a Commissioner of the Circuit Court of the United States for said District," amount, in legal intendment, to an averment that he was such a Commissioner as is particularly described by the act of 1850?

If every person who is a Commissioner of the Circuit Court, ex-officio, possesses, by law, the powers as to arresting, imprisoning and bailing offenders, granted to Justices of the Peace by the act of 1789, then it might be intended by the Court that this Commissioner had those powers, and consequently that he was one of those Commissioners upon whom the act of 1850 conferred the power to grant such a warrant. But, on the other hand, if there may be Commissioners appointed by the Circuit Court who do not possess these powers, then an averment that a person was a Commissioner appointed by this Court does not amount to an averment that he was *such* a Commissioner as is described by the act of 1850, and therein empowered to issue warrants of this kind.

It was argued by the defendants' counsel that this Court issues commissions to take depositions in particular cases, and that the persons thus empowered are Commissioners appointed by the Circuit Court. We feel some doubt whether persons acting under a *dedimus protestatem*, in a particular case, are so far known to the laws of the United States as Commissioners appointed by the Circuit Court that we could say they might fairly and would naturally be included under those terms. But there is a class of Commissioners appointed by the Circuit Court, not adverted to by counsel, who are known to the laws of the United States as Commissioners, and who do not, *ex-officio*, possess the powers to arrest, imprison and bail offenders against the laws of the United States.

By the act of Congress of Aug. 12, 1848, sec. 1, passed to give effect to stipulations in treaties with foreign governments, for the extradition of persons charged with certain crimes, power to arrest and hold for extradition is conferred, amongst others, upon "Commissioners authorized so to do by any of the Courts of the United States." We think it clear that Commissioners appointed for this purpose, under this act, would not possess, *ex-officio*, the powers to arrest, imprison, and bail, offenders against the laws of the United States. It is true that it seems to have been the design of Congress, when it has from time to time conferred new powers upon Commissioners appointed by the Circuit Courts of the United States, to confer them upon that class of Commissioners who were originally authorized to be appointed by the act of February 20, 1812, to take bail and affidavits in civil cases, in the Circuit Courts, and, accordingly, by apt terms the persons so appointed have been described, in subsequent laws, as those to whom the new authority was intended to be given. Acts of March 1, 1817 (3 Stat. at Large.); August 23, 1842, sec. 1 (5 Stat. at Large.); August 8, 1846 (9 Stat. at Large.).

In all these instances, as well as in the act of 1850, for the extradition of fugitives from service, the intention of Congress is apparent, to confer power on that class of Commissioners who had been or should be appointed to take bail and affidavits, &c. But the act of August 12, 1848, for extradition under treaties, does not confine the powers therein granted to Commissioners who had been, or should be, appointed to take affidavits and bail, or to arrest, imprison or bail offenders against the laws of the United States. There is not only the absence of any such description of the Commissioners who are to exercise the powers conferred by the act of 1848, but the sixth section provides in terms that "it shall be lawful for the Courts of the United States, or any of them, to authorize *any person or persons* to act as a Commissioner under the provisions of this act."

By force of this act, therefore, there may be Commissioners appointed by the Circuit Court for this District, to exercise the powers therein conferred, and those only. The averment that the person who issued this warrant was a Commissioner appointed by the Circuit Court would be fully satisfied by proof that he was thus appointed to make extradition under treaties, though he had no other power whatever. And it necessarily follows that this averment does not show to the Court that this was *such* a Commissioner as had lawful power to issue this warrant, and, consequently, the indictment does not show that the warrant was legal process, because it does not show that it proceeded from one having lawful authority to issue it.

We have been referred to a precedent of an indictment for resisting an officer of the United States in the service of a legal process, found in Wharton's Precedents, 507. That process issued from a District Court of the United States, a court of record, and not technically an inferior court. All its jurisdiction of powers are matter of law, to be judicially noticed. The distinction between such a court and a magistrate having only a special authority is settled. In favour of the jurisdiction of the latter, the law makes no intendment. 1. Saund. R., 70, n. r, 1 ch. pl. 306. Sackett vs. Andrews. 5, Hill, 330.

These principles of criminal pleading are so well settled, and their applicability to this case is so clear, that no authority need be adverted to. But the case of the King *vs.* Everett, 8 B. & C., 114, is in point. That was an indictment for unlawfully soliciting one Hooper, a person employed in the service of the customs, to omit to make a seizure. The law did not make it the duty of all persons employed in the service of the customs, or confer on all such persons the power to make seizures, but only on certain officers of the customs, and persons empowered for that purpose by the commissioner of the customs. The indictment alleged that Hooper was a person employed in the service of the customs, and that it was his duty in such employment to make a certain seisure.

The defendant, having been convicted, moved, in arrest of judgment, that the indictment did not show that Hooper could by law make a seizure. The Court held the objection fatal; that it was not enough to aver it was the duty of Hooper to make the seizure; that the facts from which that duty arose must be stated; that, as all persons in the service of the customs had not this power, and as no other fact besides his being in that service was alleged, the judgment must be arrested.

In the case at bar, as in that case, only certain persons possess the power in question. It is not shown that Mr. Loring was one of those persons; and the allegation that the warrant was duly issued does not help the indictment. Whether duly or unduly issued is a question of law, and the facts to constitute a due issue must be pleaded, that the Court may be able to decide whether the issue of the warrant was duly or unduly made; just as in the case of 7 B. & C. it was held not sufficient to aver that it was the duty of Hooper to make the seizures, but the facts from which that duty arose should be averred.

It may be suggested that, inasmuch as the appointment of Mr. Loring emanated from this Court, and is a matter of record here, the Court may take judicial notice of the fact that he was authorized to act as a Commissioner, in arresting, imprisoning and bailing offenders against the laws of the United States, and so that he was such a Commissioner as described in the act of 1850. We suppose it to be true that Mr. Loring was such a Commissioner, and that his authority could be proved by producing the record of his appointment; but this cannot affect the decision of the question now under consideration. An indictment must contain every averment necessary to show that an offence has been committed; and the want of any such averment cannot be supplied by showing that the fact thus omitted appears on other records of the Court. Suppose a conviction upon an indictment thus defective were to be carried, by writ of error, to another court, the conviction must be reversed there, because the Court of Errors could have no judicial knowledge of the omitted fact. Yet, if erroneous in the Court above, it would be equally erroneous in the Court below. The indictment must be sufficient of itself, when aided by those intendments which the law required to be made from what appears therein; and it cannot be made good by merely extraneous matter, though that may be matter of record.

It is true this objection to the indictment is technical, and there does not seem to be reason to suppose that, in this case, the absence of this averment in the indictment can be of any practical consequence to the defendant, so far as respects the substantial merits of his case. But the rules of law which prescribe the essentials of a good indictment are as binding on the Court as the act of Congress under which the indictment is framed, and the defendant has the same right to call on the Court to give complete effect to the former as the Government has to require the enforcement of the latter.

For these reasons, we are of opinion that it does not appear by this first count that the warrant got out therein was legal process.

It has been made a question, at the argument, whether the indictment shows that Burns was held, at the time of the alleged obstruction, under the original warrant, or under the order made by the Commissioner on the adjournment, or under both. But as it is not shown by the count that Mr. Loring was such a Commissioner as was empowered by the act of 1850 to hear and determine this subject matter, it necessarily follows that it is not material in this case how that question should be decided.

Of the other counts in the indictment, it is necessary to say only that neither of them is as full and specific as the first, and neither of them contains enough to show that the process alleged to be obstructed was legal. One of them seems to have been framed in conformity with precedents under the laws of the States for resisting, opposing or assaulting an officer of the law while in the performance of his duty. But the act of 1790 requires that the officer should be resisted, obstructed or opposed in serving or attempting to serve, or execute, some order or rule of a court, or some legal process. State officers, especially those who are guardians of the public peace, have many official duties to perform without process.

They are protected by the laws under whose authority they act in discharging their duties; and offences may be committed against them, and consequently persons may be indicted therefor without alleging or proving that any legal process existed. So, under the 8th section of the act of 1850, the offence of resisting or obstructing the claimant, or any one lawfully assisting him, either with or without process, is described; and an indictment under that section need not show that any legal process existed. But under the act of 1790, the resistance or obstruction of some legal process or precept is the very gist of the offence, and, therefore, the indictment must show what the process or precept was, and must set forth such facts as, if true, would make the process legal.

Our opinion is that, as neither of the counts in this indictment describes, by sufficient averments, any offence under the act of 1790, under which alone the government claims that the indictment can be supported, it must be quashed.

This renders it unnecessary to decide the other questions which have been argued, and, with one exception, we desire to be understood as neither expressing nor intimating any opinion thereon. There is, however, one question which has been argued by one of the defendants' counsel, which so far affects both the past and present practice of the Court that it would be unjust to the suitors to allow it to be supposed that any doubt can be raised concerning it.

At the October Term, 1832, this Court adopted a roster of towns and cities from which jurors, to serve in the Circuit Court, were to be returned. This roster contained ten distinct tables of towns and cities, in which the name of the town or city was set down, and opposite each was placed the number of grand and traverse jurors who were to be drawn therefrom. One of these tables was to be used for each term, taking the tables in rotation as they stand on the roster. This practice has been followed, as we understand, from the adoption of the order to the present time. The roster embraces a large part of the maritime towns and cities of the State, and many others, whose local situation rendered access to the place where the Court is required by law to be held comparatively cheap and easy.

It excluded the more remote interior towns of the State altogether. In forming these lists of towns, this Court was undoubtedly governed by that clause of the 29th section of the act of Congress of September 24, 1789, which provides that jurors "shall be returned, as there shall be occasion for them, *from such parts of the district*, from time to time, as the Court shall direct, so as shall be most favourable to an impartial trial, and so as not to incur an unnecessary expense, or unduly to burthen the citizens of any part of the district with such services." In the discharge of the duties thus made incumbent on the Court by this act, our predecessors seem to have considered, as we have done, that, inasmuch as a large part of both the civil and criminal cases tried here are of a commercial or maritime character, a jury drawn from commercial and maritime towns would be most conversant with such transactions generally, and best able to bring to their investigation that experience which would enable them most satisfactorily to decide such controversies; following, in this respect, as nearly as the circumstances will permit, the well-known maxim of the common law, recognised both in the Constitution and laws of the United States, that a jury should come from the vicinage, and also that, in drawing jurors from those cities and towns not remote from the place where the Court is held, they would obey the other requirements of the statute, to avoid unnecessary expense. And, further, that the population of the towns and cities embraced in the roster was so great, and the number of jurors and the length of their attendance necessary to do the business of the Court comparatively so small, that the inhabitants of those towns and cities would not be unduly burthened by the service.

It is now insisted, however, that it has been discovered by one of the defendants' counsel that, since the year 1840, this Court has been pursuing an illegal practice by using this roster; that a jury summoned in pursuance of it is not returned according to the laws of the United States, and, consequently, that not only this indictment, but all presentments and verdicts here made, or rendered, for a period of over fourteen years, have been illegal and invalid.

The supposed ground for attributing this very grave mistake to the Court is, that, by an act of Congress of July 20, 1840, section one, the clause of the 20th section of the Judiciary Act, under which the Court has acted, was repealed. To ascertain whether this be so, it is necessary to examine the two statutes. The clause in the Judiciary Act of 1789 is as follows:

"And jurors, in all cases, to serve in the Courts of the United States shall be designated, by lot or otherwise, in each State respectively, according to the mode of forming juries therein now practised, so far as the laws of the same shall render such designation practicable by the Courts or Marshals of the United States; and the jurors shall have the same qualifications as are requisite for jurors by the laws of the State of which they are citizens, to serve in the highest courts of law of such State, and shall be returned, as there shall be occasion for them, from such parts of the district, from time to time, as the Court shall direct, so as shall be most favourable to an impartial trial, and so as not to incur an unnecessary expense, or unduly to burthen the citizens of any part of the district with such service."

This clause provides for three things:

1. The mode of designating jurors, as by ballot, lot or otherwise.

2. The qualifications of jurors, as age, citizenship, residence, &c.

3. The locality from which jurors, so designated and so qualified, shall be drawn.

The first two are required to be governed, as nearly as may be, by the laws of the States, as they existed on the 24th day of September, 1789. The third is referred to the discretion of the Court, to be regulated by the considerations as to impartiality, expense and undue burthen of the service, which are pointed out in the act.

The third particular is that now in question, and the act of July 20, 1840, section 1, which is relied on as repealing this third provision, is as follows:

"That jurors to serve in the courts of the United States, in each State respectively, shall have the like qualifications, and be entitled to the like exemptions, as jurors of the highest courts of law of such State now have and are entitled to, and shall hereafter from time to time have and be entitled to, and shall be designated by ballot, lot, or otherwise, according to the mode of forming such juries now practised and hereafter to be practised therein, in so far as such mode may be practicable by the courts of the United States, or the officers thereof; and for this purpose the said courts shall have power to make all necessary rules and regulations for conforming the designation and empanelling of juries, in substance, to the laws and usages now in force in such States; and, further, shall have power, by rule or order, from time to time, to conform the same to any change in these respects which may be hereafter adopted by the Legislatures of the respective States for the State courts."

It is obvious, even on a cursory reading of the act of 1840, that it does not expressly repeal the former law, or any part of it; and, also, that it contains nothing touching the subject of the locality from which the jurors are to be drawn. It applies solely to the first two particulars embraced in the former law, viz., the mode of designating jurors, and their qualifications. It changes the law as to the mode of designation, and the qualifications of jurors in this: that whereas, by the act of 1789, the laws of the States existing in September, 1789, were the only rules respecting qualifications and mode of designation, this act of 1840 adopts as rules of qualification and mode of designation, the laws of the States which existed on the 20th day of July, 1840, and also any State laws which might thereafter be passed touching those subjects.

The practical necessity for this change in the law is very apparent. The act of 1790 having reference only to the State laws then in existence, there were no rules on this subject in the new States, by force of any positive law. This necessity is met by the act of 1850, and there it stops. Neither in terms nor by any implication has it repealed the residue of the law of 1789, which confers a discretionary power on the Court respecting the parts of the Districts from which the jurors are to be drawn.

It is a well settled and familiar rule that the law does not favour repeals by implication, and a subsequent statute repeals a former statute by implication only so far as the one is directly and necessarily repugnant to, or inconsistent with the other. There is no repugnance between these two acts, as respects the locality from which jurors are to be drawn. Both may stand together without conflict or inconsistency.

In this same 29th section of the act of 1789 occurs another provision respecting the locality from which jurors are to be drawn. It is as follows:

"In cases punishable with death, the trial shall be had in the county where the offence was committed, or, where that cannot be done without great inconvenience, twelve petit jurors at least shall be summoned from thence."

Certainly, the act of 1840 has not repealed this clause. Yet there is as good ground for so arguing as for the assertion that it has repealed the other direction, contained in the same section, respecting the locality from which jurors shall be summoned. Our clear opinion is that so much of the act of 1789 as requires this Court to determine from what parts of the District jurors are to be drawn, is still in force, and consequently this objection is without foundation.

Upon another objection to the indictment, grounded on the fact that the venire for the grand jury was issued to and returned by the Marshal, and that he was not an indifferent person within the meaning of the 49th section of the act of 1789, and that for this cause the Court should, on motion, quash the indictment, after it had been received and filed, and the defendant had been put to plead thereto, we have formed no opinion. If it had been alleged that the Marshal, or any person concerned in returning the Grand Jury, had been guilty of any unfair or improper conduct in forming the panel, we should have deemed it our duty carefully and promptly to investigate the charge. This would have been due to the purity of the administration of the law, which the Court should most sedulously guard.

But the objection has been rested merely upon the legal ground that, however fair in point of fact may have been the conduct of the Marshal, he was not legally qualified to return this Grand Jury. As the question, in the mode in which it is presented, is attended with difficulty, and as it is not necessary to a determination of the motion to quash the indictment, and as it does not affect the general practice of the Court, we have thought it proper to reserve our decision thereon until it shall need to be decided, and until it shall come before us unattended by the difficulties which arise from the time and mode of raising it.

The result is, that the motion to quash the indictment, for the cause that it does not appear therein that any offence was committed, must be allowed.

LETTER FROM BOSTON.

KNOW-NOTHING NONSENSE WORKED OUT.

THE hopes of high-minded men, for the new party, are fast dying out in this region, under all sorts of rebuffs. The start that was needed to be given to the public mind, in the direction of ameliorated naturalization laws, and a more careful investigation of the real character of Romish aggression in this country, has nearly spent its force. As that object, together with a dissolution of the petrified shell that encrusted the superannuated parties, furnished the only justification of the movement, nothing is left for it but to expire naturally, or else fall into the snare of other political organizations, and go on fighting for self-perpetuation as a party, with the usual party weapons and pertinacity. There is extreme danger of the latter result. If that happens, the party will probably prove as much more dangerous and corrupt than others as its secrecy endows it with more capacity and facilities for mischief. The Massachusetts Legislature has committed so many petty blunders that it ought, at least, to have jealously held fast its reputation for common civility. Even a numbskull is tolerated in good society as long as he behaves respectfully to his neighbours. In appointing a committee to visit and examine any schools and other institutions in the commonwealth, the General Court would have done well, provided the powers of a such a committee had been properly limited and guarded, and the committee itself been composed of gentlemen. What is wanting is a Standing *Commission*, qualified to listen to all complaints of such seminaries, and, the moment there appears any cause for suspicion, to institute a legal and complete investigation of the facts. No school in this country—convent, nunnery, or whatever—should be privileged with power to exclude inspection, and draw shutters over its proceedings. But even this wholesome measure of oversight, and security to Protestant citizens, has been cast into sickening disgust, by the vulgar doings of the Legislative Committee which, the other day, mixed a convivial frolic, in a neighbouring city, with the ransacking of a quiet, inoffensive little school, kept by Catholic ladies for young girls. It is not probable that the peepings and fingerings, the prying into sick chambers, handling female wardrobes, and irreverent boorishness in a consecrated chapel, which are so undeniably fixed upon this jolly company of dignitaries, were prompted by any base or profligate passions. That implication is extravagant and absurd. The grand difficulty was that the persons were not competent to so delicate a trust, were of small natures, and of smaller breeding—had no proper sense of their errand, and no true self-respect—had been weakly misled by some awful "Red Dragon" anti-Papist conjurations, and were boyishly bent on showing their consequence. The public sentiment and public press of the State have given them a lesson, and they are stupid scholars if they do not learn it. Whatever facts the ordered inquiry may bring to light, the main grounds of the offence will not be removed.

TRIAL OF REVEREND REBELS.

What many sensible persons regard as the infatuation of a grand jury has prepared the wished-for day that arraigns the free

at base calumny, and persevere unto the end—let him look beyond the grave for his glory and victory. M. E. W.
—*Evangelist.*

ANTI-CHRIST.

A NEW VIEW OF KNOW-NOTHINGISM.

We find in the *Christian Inquirer* an extract from a sermon preached by Rev. S. J. May, of this city, in Rochester, which presents some new and striking views on the subject of Know-Nothingism. The subject of the sermon was Anti-Christ; and Anti-Christ was defined to be the *Spirit of Persecution*. Christ suffered everything from this spirit; he did not, however, retaliate; but, on the other hand, steadily taught that when smitten on one cheek, we should turn the other also. Still, persecution and cruelty continue, and it is now as it ever has been, against the teachings of Christianity. Mr. May, having brought these facts to view, goes on as follows.
—*Syracuse Chronicle.*

We have a remarkable illustration of the truth of what I say, in our own country, at this very time. For the last twenty-five years, the friends of humanity—the fellow-labourers of Christ—have been earnestly contending against the two deadliest enemies of the religious and civil welfare of this Republic—*Intemperance* and *Slavery*. The conflict with each has been severe. All the powers of hell have been summoned to their aid; yet the army of the Lord has been gaining continual accessions of numbers and strength. The strongholds of intemperance seemed about to be carried, and the late daring sortie of slavery to be driven back into its old entrenchments, if not routed from them.

Just at this crisis, the host of Anti-Christ, secretly enrolled, under false pretences, with a banner on which NOTHING was inscribed, came stealthily into the field, and caused a diversion that has well-nigh given the victory to the foe.

The right of suffrage in our Republic may be too free. Many of our wisest and best men have thought it was so. The old Federalists forewarned us that universal suffrage would be our ruin. But where should it be restricted? That was the pregnant question. If any men ought to be debarred the elective franchise in a democracy, one would think it should be those men who have so little respect for humanity that they have robbed thousands of their poor neighbours of all the rights of man, and have reduced them to the condition of domesticated brutes.

Next to slaveholders, one would think that the men who, of all others, should be denied the great prerogative of freemen are *intemperate persons*, those who are wont to deprive themselves of their reason, so that they know not what they do. This vice, more than all others, disables a man for the government of himself; and so unfits him to take any part in the government of the nation. But intemperance, and the customs that lead to it, have been so prevalent in our country since the Revolution, that they have hardly been accounted vicious, until within the last thirty years. No provisions were made against them in the formation of our government. Now, therefore, no change can be made touching the elective franchise but by the suffrages of the people, the majority of whom (excluding the female half) have hitherto been on the side of Intemperance, and will continue to be until a power higher than the Ballot-box has converted the people from the dreadful error of their ways.

Seeing, then, that slaveholders and intemperate men (the most dangerous of all men in a democracy) have been, from the first, admitted to exercise the right of suffrage in our country, with what show of fairness can we withhold it from others? Grant that intelligence and virtue are indispensable to the stability of our institutions, and therefore should be required in the individuals who uphold them. What amount of intelligence, what measure of moral worth shall be demanded? It cannot be higher than that of the average of those excellences among the people, for the same reason that the stream cannot rise higher than its fountain. So that we must be left as we are to struggle along, in our political as well as social relations, with all the evils of falsehood, fraud, ignorance, intemperance, and slavery, until, by the exertions and sacrifices of the friends of truth, knowledge, purity and freedom, the majority are brought over to the side of God and Humanity.

Such seems to be the order of providence. I do not question its wisdom. The whole body politic is thus made dependent for its welfare upon the health and vigour of each of its members—upon the hands and the feet as well as upon the head. Those members, which we are wont to think less honourable, upon them are we thus compelled to bestow the more attention; and even those which seem to be the most feeble are found to be necessary, and must be cared for.

The intelligence, integrity, purity of every one in a democracy is a matter of great importance to all. Point me, if you can, to a boy or girl in the land, whatever be their parentage, however depressed may now be their condition, of whom you can say with certainty that they will never be so placed that their right or wrong action may affect vitally the public well-being. For my part, I am willing the State and the Church should suffer, as they must, until the constituents of the one and the other are taught to know, love and obey the true and the right.

Great progress has been made towards the redemption of our country from the greatest iniquities, her mortal enemies, Intemperance and Slavery. In several States, the sale of intoxicating drinks has been utterly prohibited; and a law to this effect has passed both branches of our Legislature, and would now be in operation in this State but for the veto of our late Governor. Slavery, too, has been unmasked, brought out from her entrenchments into the open field, where she may be confronted by Liberty face to face; forced into a conflict hand to hand. There can be no doubt of the issue of the battle when it comes; though the frame work of our present confederacy may not be strong enough to endure the struggle, *Freedom must triumph.*

But just at the moment when Intemperance and Slavery were fairly exposed, as the only enemies whom the people had to meet; when the Lord's host were coming out in mighty array against our Gog and Magog; just at this crisis a diversion has been effected; a new party has rushed into the field, not openly on the side of Intemperance and Slavery, and yet manifestly averting their discomfiture. This legion comprises, undoubtedly, many well-meaning men, who have been misguided by false alarms or by sectarian prejudices. The leaders of this movement have invoked the spirit of Anti-Christ—hatred of a portion of the people because of their religious faith. This has given the shrillest, loudest note to their battle-cry. And this spirit has affected most that they have done.

Of course, 'tis said, we "*know nothing*" of the intentions of this masked body. Yet we everywhere hear, and we read in the papers devoted to its interests, that it is banded against foreigners, against those who, coming to this country from under governments and political institutions wholly different from our own, cannot be reasonably supposed to understand the genius of our State and national government sufficiently well to exercise wisely the elective franchise—certainly not well enough to be eligible to any offices. Let it be granted that we have suffered serious evils from foreign immigrants, and have cause to apprehend still more serious evils. The measure proposed by the Know-Nothings is not adapted to avert those evils. It is by no means the incident of a man's birth and education in a foreign land that disqualifies him to live and do good service as a citizen in our Republic. Only his ignorance, his immorality, his love of alcohol and of slavery would disqualify him, and these faults ought to disqualify native Americans not less than foreigners. Who will deny, who can doubt that there are many of foreign birth who appreciate, value, love our democratic form of government much more truly, and are doing much more to preserve all that is good in our institutions, than many whose ancestors came to this continent two centuries ago?

Moreover, it should be considered, that if the native Americans unite against foreigners, the foreigners may be aroused to unite against the natives; and thus a contest arise, that would be as likely to result unfavourably to the former as to the latter party, and no good be obtained by the triumph of either. But, if all the friends of our Republic will exert themselves to diffuse knowledge without measure, and to give a sound moral and religious culture to all the people, then and not till then will the people generally, whether natives or foreigners, appreciate justly the elective franchise, and rise superior to the bribery which the political parties, the aspirants to office, and the General Government have so often plied with such disastrous effects.

But it is not against *foreigners* so much as against *foreigners of a particular religious faith* that this new Anti-Christ has brought out his hosts. The outbreaks of popular violence show that it is against the adherents to the Roman Catholic Church, rather than against foreigners, that opposition is invoked, and political disqualification is denounced. The unscrupulous magicians who now manage the affairs of our coutry, dreading the onslaught that was about to be made upon that "peculiar institution" which has become the especial protégé of our Federal Government, conjured up the long-cherished hatred of the Protestants to make a new issue with the Roman Catholics; and thus again divert the people from the only vital question there is in the politics of this nation—Liberty or Slavery. But, look at it! Self-contradiction, absurdity glares in the fore-front of this movement. The most anti-Christian, the worst of the bad spirits of Popery is invoked to shield us from the imaginary designs of a foreign foe, leaving us all the while and all the more a prey to the obvious designs of an intestine enemy, an enemy that has already gotten possession of our citadel, our treasury, our national Legislature—yes, possession of everything but the moral sentiment of the people, and the favour of God. Look at it steadfastly, and you will see the self-contradiction, the inconsistency of this political hostility to Popery, so long as we permit the institution of slavery to abide in our land. What is there abhorrent to us, what is there to be dreaded in the Roman Catholic domination, that does not inhere in the Slave Power already established in our land? slaveholding, that "man of sin," that embodiment of all unrighteousness, which has set itself up in our country above God, *scouting his Higher Law*. Compare American Slavery with Roman Catholicism. Does the latter usurp authority over the consciences of men? Much more does the former commit this flagrant wrong. Slavery seizes both the bodies and the souls of its victims (more than three millions), exacting from them implicit obedience, and demanding the surrender of all independent thought. Does the Roman Catholic Church withhold the Bible from its subjects? American Slavery withholds not only the blessed Book, but the power to read it or any other book. Does the Romish Church forbid marriage, enjoin celibacy upon her priests? Slavery sets at naught the marriage relation in respect to all its victims; and several of the largest religious denominations in our country have given their sanction to this desecration of the connubial tie. Does Popery sustain the inquisition, and the Auto-da-fe? Slavery has inquisitors ever present throughout the States where it abides, who are prompt to seize, imprison, torture or put to a summary death any one who may be hostile to its authority; and often are we horrified by the details that come to us of the martyrdom of its victims, *burnt at the stake*, for daring to withstand its oppressions. I might run this parallel much further; but I have said enough. What inconsistency, what absurdity could be greater than the Know-Nothings and American party are guilty of in upholding that "peculiar native institution," which comprises all that is hateful and abominable in Popery, without any of the redeeming qualities of that ancient Church, while it is exerting itself to resist the assaults of a foreign foe, whose emissaries, when they come amongst us, gradually lay aside their evil designs, if they ever had any, and thousands of whom are continually deserting the Papal for the Protestant standard.

Surely, they know nothing who do not know that Intemperance and Slavery are working our country a thousand times more harm than Roman Catholicism ever has done, or ever can do.

And they know less than nothing who do not know that persecution builds up the party or the sect against which its shafts are directed.

REV. NEHEMIAH ADAMS.

From the Boston Telegraph, April 13.

LETTER FROM REV. DR. LOWELL.

The Rev. Dr. Lowell, the oldest settled minister of the Gospel in Boston, has sent to us for publication the following remarks on the Epistle to Philemon, together with his protest, as a man and a Christian, against the pro-slavery book of Dr. Adams, of which a second edition has just appeared. This testimony in behalf of freedom, from so venerable and distinguished a clergyman, cannot fail to have weight with the public. Dr. Lowell's anti-slavery sentiments are not of recent date. He inherits them from his father, Judge Lowell, who, as one of the committee which drafted the Constitution of Massachusetts, put into the Bill of Rights the clause which abolished slavery in the Commonwealth.

Judge Lowell, also, as early as 1775, maintained that slavery was not legal in Massachusetts, and publicly offered his services as a lawyer to any person held as a slave, who wished to sue for his freedom.

To the Editor of the Boston Evening Telegraph:

Before the publication of Dr. Nehemiah Adams's pro-slavery volume, the "South-Side View of Slavery," but, after its intended publication had been announced, I wrote to him urging him to forbear from publishing a vindication of Slavery, and giving my reasons for such a request.

In his reply, he assured me that he should not publish such a work, and begged me to inform him if I was satisfied with that assurance. I did so. He was doubtless sincere in what he wrote me, but he changed his mind. The work has appeared, and is a vindication of American slavery. He did not send me a copy, but I purchased one, read as much of it as the weak state of my nerves would allow me to, and laid it aside.

I have recently taken it up again, and, having opened upon that most extraordinary passage, the rapturous eulogium upon the Epistle to Philemon, "that curiosity of inspiration," that "solitary idiom in a language," that "Stonehenge in a country," that "warm stream in the sea," &c., &c., I cannot forbear from requesting a small space in your paper for a few remarks upon this part of the volume, which is all that my health will now allow me to do. I have read but little of what has been said about the book, and may, therefore, have been anticipated in my criticisms; but as I do not *know* that I have, and as "necessity is laid upon me," I follow the promptings of my heart, assured that "it inditeth a good matter," though very imperfectly.

The pro-slavery prejudices imbibed by Dr. Adams, in his short visit to the South and superficial view of slavery, have diffused their colouring over the Epistle to Philemon as he has read it, and have led him into several mistakes in respect to it.

He asserts, in so many words, that St. Paul sent back Onesimus "into slavery," although the apostle expressly declares, in language which he who runs may read, that he did *not* send him back as a *servant*, but as a *brother*. His language is this: "I beseech thee, therefore, for my son Onesimus, whom I have sent again to thee, *not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved*, specially to me, but now much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord? If thou count me, therefore, a partner, receive him as MYSELF." Dr. Adams reads it, "receive him as a slave."

Of Onesimus, St. Paul had said previously, "Whom I would have retained with me, that, *in thy stead*, he might have ministered to me in the bonds of the Gospel." Surely, Paul would not have received ministrations from his friend Philemon as from a slave, but, as in truth he was, "a brother beloved."

Such, as I have quoted, was the language used by St. Paul in this Epistle—an Epistle which I, too, prize most highly, but for a reason just the opposite of that which gives it so much value in the estimation of Dr. Adams. Such is the language which is interpreted by Dr. Adams as showing that the Apostle (notwithstanding the anti-Fugitive Slave law clause in the Jewish code, and the spirit and precepts of the Gospel of Christ) sent back Onesimus to his former master as a slave! Could language have been used more directly *opposed* to this interpretation?

Let me beg Dr. Adams to read the Epistle to Philemon again, to read it attentively, prayerfully; and I cannot doubt that, with his intelligent mind and kind heart, he will no longer interpret it as he has done.

Onesimus, when he "departed for a season" from Philemon, went to Rome, led, as I believe, and as Paul himself seems to intimate, by the Spirit of God, and visited Paul, whom he had probably often seen at the home of his master at Colosse. In his intercourse with the Apostle at Rome, he became a convert to Christianity, and was sent back by Paul in a new character, bearing to his former master the relation of a Christian brother, and as such was commended to the love and friendship which Paul himself would claim and receive from his friend.

If my memory does not mislead me—and I have no opportunity, in my sick chamber, of referring to authorities to refresh it—the very fact of conversion to Christianity, in the earliest ages of the Church, rendered every servant free who at the time of his conversion was in the service of a Christian. He was "Christ's freeman," and could not be in bondage to a disciple of Christ.

According to the ancient ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius, who was bishop of Caesarieia, in the fourth century, Onesimus afterwards became bishop of the important church of Ephesus, in which office he succeeded Timothy, another convert of the Apostle Paul. Is it probable that such a man would have been, with Paul's consent, held as a slave, a chattel, a piece of property, like the slaves of the South?

Paul was no advocate for the inhuman traffic in human beings. In the black catalogue of crimes in his Epistle to Timothy, the crime of "man-stealing" has a prominent place; and they are surely "men-stealers" who buy and sell men and women who were originally stolen, and from whom they steal that which is most precious to them—the possession of themselves, and of that which is nearest and dearest.

But I forbear, on this topic.

I do not write anonymously, for my animadversions are on a book which has been published to the world, which has doubtless been extensively read, and which has been almost universally condemned at the North and applauded at the South. I have written most of this on the Sabbath, for, if it is lawful on that day to rescue from destruction a perishing brute, it is surely lawful to write a plea for our down-trodden and oppressed brethren.

My own idea of slavery, formed long ago, from a view of it under its most favourable aspects, and from the opinion of it expressed to me by Mr. Madison, in his own home in Virginia, is very different from that entertained by Dr. Adams.

I value the union of the States as much, perhaps, as Dr. Adams does, though I would not preserve it by a compromise with wickedness, and as a "partaker of other men's sins." I differ, however, entirely from Dr. Adams with respect to what endangers the Union. It is the existence of slavery that endangers it. It is the slaveholders and not the opponents of slavery who endanger it. Abolish slavery, and the perpetuity of the Union, under God, is secured. CHARLES LOWELL.

Elmwood, Cambridge, April 10, 1855.

SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER, March 18, 1855.

Well, I have, to a limited extent, had a view of slavery at home. I have seen the apparently happy and cheerful countenances of hundreds of draymen in the city of Charleston; have gazed upon the vast cotton-fields swarming with these people, the women generally holding the plough; have been into their cabins; have conversed with them freely, under a variety of circumstances; and last, but not least, have seen them labelled and sold on the stand of the auctioneer. And I have seen too—with a great deal more that was painful—the *re*-marriage of those who are sold away from their own families to another plantation. "But is it *all* dark, or is there a brighter side to the picture?" There is much less of the latter than I expected to find. I came out South, with my mind open to conviction touching the subject, and have endeavoured to look at it with all the favour I could summon. I have even sought for its "virtues." The result has been a serious conviction that it is a bad system, and, as it regards the *traffic*, an unmitigated sin in the light of heaven. Away from the cities, the moral and religious influence brought to bear upon the slave is, in the main, exceedingly limited. In visiting some of their churches, it is true, I have been a good deal interested, though I did not hear any of their own preachers. In general, their worship partakes much of what may be called truly devotional. I was particularly struck, on one occasion, with the singing. The way the congregation "tuned up" was a caution to *weak* lungs, if not to shattered nerves! But, after all, I could not, in its way, help liking it.

After all that has been said to the contrary, one may express his opinion very freely, on this subject, at the South. But Pharoah never stuck with a tighter grasp to the Israelites than do the people to this system. The sad effects of the system end not with the *slave*. They are manifest throughout the South. While the warm sun, and genial, balmy atmosphere throw an air of loveliness over the face of nature—the green foliage beginning to appear, even while it is yet winter at the North—though, in this respect, "every prospect pleases"—still, as you pass through the country, the query is constantly forcing itself on the mind, "Why this cheerless, dilapidated appearance of the work of man?" "Why this slow speed of the cars—these tedious delays on the road?" "Where is the pleasant village church-spire, and the little square school-house?" Indeed, where are all those arrangements that go to make up the charm of a New England village?" Nowhere can they be found. While *all* this may not be attributable to slavery, yet facts will warrant the response that very much of it is. One is surprised at the absence of enterprise and thrift. The great absorbing idea is *cotton, cotton!* * * * * * G. H.
—*Evangelist.*]

MASSACHUSETTS.

Correspondence of the Evening Post.

BOSTON, April 11, 1855.

Your correspondent "Pictor," in his last letter, unintentionally did injustice to the legislative committee on the case of Judge Loring, when he intimated that the re-commitment of the matter to them was produced for the purpose of bringing out fresh testimony against the judge. Mr. Dana pressed the committee to hear further testimony, and especially that of Mr. Grimes, the coloured clergyman of this city, who was Burns's nearest friend.

There was an impression, not only among the defenders, but the assailants of Judge Loring, that Grimes was opposed to his removal, and approved his conduct of the slave trial. It proved otherwise, and the new testimony brought in at Mr. Dana's request was anything but favourable to the side he has espoused with so much ardour. Among other evidence, Theodore Parker testified that, at the time of the trial, Mr. Dana himself said to him that Loring's conduct was "atrocious."

The debate on the question of removal began in the House yesterday. The opening speech for the enemies of Loring was made by John L. Swift, a young lawyer of Boston, and now a great gun among the Know-Nothings. Though only twenty-three or four, he is already one of the most popular speakers in the State. Like General Wilson he has taken the disease of Know-Nothingism very lightly, and will probably soon be cured of it altogether. His speech, which was two hours long, had evidently the hearty sympathy of the House, and was, contrary to custom, vehemently applauded.

General Devereux, of Salem, replied with ability, but was scarcely listened to. He lost his influence in the House by heading the opposition to the election of General Wilson, with whom he had had a personal controversy. Two or three years ago Wilson publicly charged him with having, when adjutant-general, sold some brass cannon, and other property belonging to the State, and pocketing the proceeds. The charge was considered proved, though the money had, in time, been reluctantly refunded, and the matter settled, if not cleared up. The first of the many parodies on Tennyson's Balaklava ode which have appeared here, was on the movements of the Devereux Brigade in the House in opposition to Wilson. One of the stanzas began:

"Brass cannon to right of them,
Brass cannon to left of them," &c.

The doings of the Nunnery Committee are attracting universal attention. No one doubts that the charges of the *Daily Advertiser* are substantially well-founded. The nuns themselves confirm them under oath. The affair has damaged the Know-Nothings a good deal, and in their wrath, some of the leaders of the party talk of attempting to put down the newspapers—to break them down by a systematic attack upon their subscription lists and advertising patronage. They boast that through the lodges, by means of speeches made and documents read there, they can command a public or rather a party opinion which is independent of the newspapers, and enables them to dispense with and even to defy the press.

There can be no doubt that the newspapers have, from this cause, lost a good deal of their influence, which has been superseded or counteracted by that of the secret councils. But the power of the press is not yet wholly gone, and a general combination of the leading journals of Massachusetts against the Know-Nothings could hardly fail to overthrow the party.

The anti-slavery branch or off-shoot from the Know-Nothings, the Know-Somethings, is multiplying rapidly and bids fair to eclipse in New England, at least, its parent stock. It has been organized in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and, in short, in nearly all the northern tier of States. In Massachusetts alone, it has nearly a hundred Councils in operation. A number of men of distinction and influence, who have steadily kept aloof from Know-Nothingism, have joined the new order, which is said to be much more liberal than the other, and does not proscribe foreigners at all. Among the members to whom I allude, are some of the most prominent Democrats and Free Soilers in the State.

Yesterday, the new order held its quarterly State Convention in Stacy Hall in this city. It was a numerous and highly respectable looking body, I am told. A State officer of high rank from Worcester County presided. Eleven delegates and as many substitutes, one from each Congressional District, were chosen to the Know-Something National Convention, which is to meet in Cleveland in June next. Deputies were also appointed to organise the Counties of Massachusetts. After a harmonious session the Convention adjourned to meet in Worcester in July next. ESSEX.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT CONTRIVANCE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1855.

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Twenty-Second Public Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the METROPOLITAN THEATRE (on the site of the late Metropolitan Hall, in Broadway, above Bleecker street), in the city of New York, on WEDNESDAY, May 9th, at 10 o'clock, A. M. The meeting will be addressed by some of the most distinguished advocates of the Anti-Slavery Cause, whose names will be hereafter announced.

The Society will hold its meetings for business and general discussion in the FREEWILL BAPTIST CHURCH in Sullivan-street (West of Broadway and just below Houston street), commencing on THURSDAY MORNING, at 9½ o'clock, and continuing as may be determined by vote.

As full an attendance of the members and friends of the Society as practicable, from all parts of the country, is earnestly desired and strongly urged.

The object of the Society is not *merely* to make "Liberty national, and Slavery sectional"—nor to prevent the acquisition of Cuba—nor to restore the Missouri Compromise—nor to repeal the Fugitive Slave Bill—nor to resist the admission of any new slave State into the Union—nor to terminate slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the national Territories—but it is, primarily, comprehensively, and uncompromisingly, to effect the immediate, total and eternal overthrow of slavery, wherever it exists on the American soil, and to expose and confront whatever party or sect seeks to purchase peace or success at the expense of human liberty. Living or dying, our motto is, "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, RELIGIOUSLY OR POLITICALLY!"

In behalf of the Executive Committee,
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *President.*
EDMUND QUINCY, SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, } *Secretaries.*

DOINGS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Massachusetts, during the past week, has done two notable things; two things not to be forgotten in our generation, and which those coming after it will mark as positions won, and points to make new attacks from, in a great battle.

The removal of Judge Loring—the unfortunate, feeble Judge Loring, who, in quieter times, would have lived harmless and unharmed, and been buried with an unqualified "hic jacet"—has been recommended to the Governor, by the lower House of the Legislature, by an overwhelming majority. The probability is that the Senate will concur, and the Judge will be compelled to retire, unless President Pierce takes care of him, to private life. One can hardly help feeling a sort of commiseration for him, for we doubt if he meant any harm. It had never occurred to him that he had any business to be wiser or better than his neighbours, even if he had the power. Massachusetts morality and Massachusetts religion had not, a year ago, if it has now, risen so high as to condemn that worst of all thefts, the theft of a man, and Judge Loring would as soon thought of accepting a bribe to destroy a private record as to refuse obedience to the Fugitive Act of 1850. Thou shalt return to his master the fugitive from labour, had all the force with him of the commands of the Decalogue. He had never been taught anything else; he had never heard of anything else, at least from any respectable quarter; and it was as impossible then for him to do anything else as it would have been for him, a hundred years ago, to question the Divine Right of Kings. He saw his path of duty lay straight before him; morality had nothing to do with it; humanity had nothing to do with it; Christianity had nothing to do with it; there was nothing in question but a "nigger," and he would as soon have thought of considering a beast a man. It is evident that he was utterly incapable of conceiving of any other idea than that which he found ready-made for him in the mind of the community about him. He had no idea of his own about the matter, but simply did as a blind horse in a treadmill does—treads on as he is bid, not knowing what he moves, nor why he moves, except that there is a whip behind him, and oats when the time comes round.

But, unfortunately for the Judge, he was called to act when, all unknown to him, a new light had broken upon the people—that a man is a man, though be be a black one, and that to make a slave of him is as shocking an outrage upon humanity, and as daring an insult to God, as human depravity has ever dared to commit. The awakened sense of right seizes upon the first offender that presents himself. The stolid and blind Commissioner, incapable of discerning the signs of the times, utterly incapable of any other ideas than those which have been taught him, is offered up as the first sacrifice. The weak man, in such a case, suffers as heavy a penalty as though he were a conscious and determined villain. He deserves his punishment; indeed, it is a serious question whether society does not suffer more from fools than rogues, and whether, if the former were all disposed of, the latter might not be suffered to go at large with impunity. Ben. Hallett, for instance, does no great harm, for he passes for what he is worth; but Judge Loring was mischievous because he was only respectably virtuous, but too weak to be above or even to recognise a great and popular wrong.

The other thing which has been done in Boston within the past week, is the quashing of the indictments in the Burns case. We refer to our first page for the opinion of Judges Curtis and Sprague, delivered by the former. One of our contemporaries objected to the trial coming before Judge Curtis because he was a party deeply interested in its result. He has a private feud with some of the accused, and of all the men in Massachusetts, let their crimes be what they may, we doubt not, Judge Curtis would rather set Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker to hammering stones in the State Prison. The objection to his presiding at their trial, therefore, was well taken, but, nevertheless, it was a fact of very great advantage to the accused. The worst thing that can befall a man, doubtless, Judge Curtis thinks, is to hammer stone in the State Prison—one thing only excepted; and that one thing is to sit as Judge Curtis on the Bench and have Theodore Parker and Wendell Phillips before him on trial, under the Fugitive Slave Law, and acting as their own counsel. The devilish ingenuity of man has invented a good many tortures, but Hallett would have exceeded them all had he succeeded in bringing Phillips and Parker before Curtis, *he* tied to his arm-chair, and *they* with unlimited freedom of talk! We doubt if any indictment could be framed, in such a case, in which the legal acumen of Judge Curtis would not be able to pick a hole quite large enough for him to creep through. That which he found in the present indictment was almost as small as could be, but it was evidently gladly used. But nobody can blame him, however much it may be regretted that he was not willing to consent to be a spectacle to men and angels.

This, no doubt, is the end of the Burns trials. The only man who is likely to be punished—as Judge Curtis has so ingenuously escaped the penalty prepared for him—is the Commissioner who returned the man to bondage. We would not be premature in our rejoicings, but should the Senate confirm, as it is confidently believed it will, the vote of the House, and the Governor comply with it, we shall, for once, unite with the concluding prayer of the Annual Thanksgiving Proclamation—"God Save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!"

ESCAPE OF A SLAVE.

A curious case of carelessness on one side, and of good luck on the other, occurred a few days since, on one of the steamers plying between this port and Richmond, Va. It resulted in the escape from slavery of a woman and her child, and excited a well-grounded apprehension, on the part of those who were inadvertently instrumental in that violation of the Constitution, that it might "deliver" them "up" to the tender mercies of Virginia law. The facts are thus stated in the *Evening Post* of Saturday:

The fine steamship Jamestown, running between this port and Norfolk and Richmond, in connection with the steamer Roanoke, has just had a narrow escape from confiscation by the laws of Virginia. On Wednesday of last week, we believe, the Jamestown took on board at Richmond, as a passenger to Norfolk, a fine-looking young mulatto slave woman. The laws of Virginia are very strict in regard to this class of passengers, and no slave can go on board of a vessel unless some one enters into bonds for his value in case he should be a fugitive.

In the case of this woman, the police, who were well acquainted with her, became her voucher. She was owned at Norfolk by a widow lady, and had obtained permission from her employer at Richmond to visit her mistress.

On board of the Jamestown there were a number of free coloured persons bound to New York. The slave took up her quarters in the apartment kept for coloured passengers, and it is supposed they induced her to journey on with them to the Empire city.

The Jamestown arrived at Norfolk in the afternoon, and the travellers booked for that place left the ship including, as was supposed, the slave from Richmond. Not suspecting anything wrong, the captain and all hands were busily engaged in transferring the freight and getting the ship ready to sail for New York. About seven o'clock she left the wharf and resumed her trip to this city.

The slave, it seems, did not go ashore at Norfolk, but remained in her berth, forward of the wheelhouse, on the starboard side of the ship. It is a little, narrow place, and is reached from the main deck by a sort of trapdoor. It is a capital hiding spot, and one in which few persons would seek for "lost property." At any rate, no attempts of the kind had ever been made on the Jamestown before, and the purser did not think of exploring the vessel for "stowaways."

Upon the arrival of the Jamestown at this city, on Friday morning, all the passengers quitted the ship, including the slave, who was accompanied by one of the free negroes. The steward of the ship, Mr. Graham, happening to be on the wharf, looked into a carriage as he was passing to the ship, and thought he recognised the slave woman. He forthwith informed Captain Parrish and the other officers of the ship of his suspicions. All hands were terribly alarmed, and went out in search of the carriage, but it had been rapidly driven away.

Inquiries were made about the driver of the coach, who returned to the wharf in about an hour afterwards. He informed Capt. Parrish that he had taken the woman to the house of a coloured family in Sullivan street. During the morning the captain obtained the aid of two of our city police, and sought an interview with the slave for the purpose of inducing her quietly to return to her mistress.

The slave-hunters were admitted to the house, and saw the woman. She was surrounded by a large number of her coloured friends. Captain Parrish persuaded her to consent to go home with him the next day. She is said to have expressed a willingness to accompany him, but the negroes would not allow her to go, and the party having no legal warrant, could not take possession of the "property."

In the afternoon of the same day, Friday, the steward and purser thought they would try their hands at a replevy of the lost chattel. They repaired to the abode of the slave, but she was not to be found. Upon making known their desire to converse with her, the coloured people were up in arms and were disposed to treat the young men roughly. Not altogether pleased with the appearance of matters, and fearful they might be worsted, they beat a retreat.

The Jamestown was to sail the following day, Saturday, for Richmond. The anxieties of the officers began to increase as the time arrived for their departure without the slave. They had unwillingly violated the laws of Virginia, and dreaded the heavy penalty which is inflicted in such cases. The punishment of the captain, we believe, is two thousand dollars fine and five years imprisonment, both, penalties which the captain had no wish to share.

The day and hour for the Jamestown arrived, but no tidings were received of the girl, and, finally, the captain had to leave without her and haunted with dismal forebodings of the entertainment which awaited him at Richmond.

Upon his arrival in that city, however, he was agreeably surprised to hear nothing about the escape of the slave. Nobody was even aware of the fact that she had not been left with her friends at Norfolk. This gave the captain a good opportunity of securing an interview with the mistress of the slave, and stating the circumstances under which she had escaped to New York. She was satisfied of his innocence in the matter, and after a consultation she consented to settle the matter peaceably if the owners of the Jamestown would pay her $1,250 for the woman. This was agreed to by Captain Parrish very cheerfully, and his liabilities to the people of the State of Virginia for harbouring runaway slaves were discharged.

The Jamestown returned to New York again yesterday morning, bringing to her owners the agreeable intelligence we have narrated.

We presume the captain took a bill of sale of the girl, and of course has power to reclaim her wherever he may find her. Whether he is disposed to reduce her to servitude again or not, we are not advised, but we trust he will rely upon some less exceptionable means of indemnifying himself for the loss which he has sustained.

There are some errors in this statement, though it is, in the main, correct, which we are enabled to rectify, Mr. Drum, who *was* the second Steward on board the Jamestown, having called upon us, and given, both by word of mouth and in writing, the true version of the affair. The *Post* seems not to be aware that the woman, whose name is Harriett, had her child with her, which, like herself, was, of course, a slave, and with her is now free. Harriett belonged to Washington, where her husband, a free man, now resides. She was, however, at service, in Richmond, where her mistress, who was on a visit at Norfolk, sent for her. She embarked on board the Jamestown, with the consent of her employer, and in obedience to the orders of her mistress to join her at Norfolk.

A cabin passage was taken for her, Mr. Drum says, but she was put into the steerage, where there was neither beds nor fire. She complained of this to Drum, who asked permission to put her and her child in the servants' room. When the ship arrived at Norfolk, she expected, of course, to be sent on shore, but as neither captain nor purser made any inquiries, or gave any directions about her, she quietly remained below. As a piece of goods "shipped in good order and well-conditioned," and, doubtless, "marked and numbered as in the margin," what business had she to discharge herself and child, and so run the risk of accident and forfeiture of insurance, and, perhaps, bring the ship into trouble for loss of freight? She did as well-behaved freight always does—awaited the action of the proper officer.

But when the ship arrived at New York, where the Law of Virginia, which makes of persons things, is no longer paramount, if anybody has temerity enough to assert the contrary, Harriett asserted her inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness in her own way, and took a carriage.

Then it was, as the *Post* relates, that it dawned upon the Captain's mind, that that "nigger" and her baby should have been discharged, with other cargo, at Norfolk; and then also he remembered the penalty made and provided in Virginia for the conveyance of such merchandise beyond her jurisdiction. His first application for relief was to the hackman; but no patriotic feelings were allowed to hold sway in his bosom to the disparagement of business; he made the Captain pay him seventy-five dollars for taking him to the house where he had already taken Harriett. But hard as it was to find her, it was still harder to get her. First, he upbraided her for leaving his vessel, as if she were not the aggrieved party at being brought by his carelessness, so far from home! Then he demanded that she should return to the ship, and call at the Captain's office and settle for her passage, which she had neglected to do before leaving. The coloured people present offered the passage-money on the spot, but that was not what the Captain wanted. He appealed to the policemen for aid in securing her; but they, very properly, and much to their credit, declined such interference. Harriett, however, was thoroughly frightened, and presently ended the controversy by a flying leap out of the window into the yard below, preferring the imminent chance of breaking her neck to the remote one of returning to her mistress in Norfolk.

We wish no harm to the Jamestown, or her Commander, and certainly, if the presence of evil intent is necessary to make an act criminal, Capt. Parrish should not be held amenable to the violated law of Virginia. His bringing away the woman was a mere act of forgetfulness, and he did all he could to correct that blunder. The authorities of Richmond and Norfolk should be satisfied that no slave will escape by his connivance. Still, the law was violated, and we do not feel certain that the outraged majesty of Virginia will be satisfied because Harriett's mistress has compounded the felony. As to Harriett herself, she is beyond the reach of the Captain and owners of the Jamestown, even should they be disposed to take her and her child to make good their outlay of twelve hundred dollars. She is not, however, a fugitive from labour, and no just Judge would recognise any claim that could be set up for her. Just Judges, however, are not to be had for the asking, and the safer way, therefore, is that she should keep out of the clutches of slave-hunters, Commissioners, and other kidnappers.

ANNIVERSARY WEEK IN NEW YORK.

The time has arrived when Abolitionists, in various parts of the country, will expect to be informed of the arrangements for Anti-Slavery Agitation in New York, during Anniversary Week. Happily, we are able to give them now the information they seek by announcing the following programme of Lectures and meetings, viz.:

1. On Tuesday evening, May 8th, at 7 3-4 o'cl'k, the Hon. HENRY WILSON, the lately elected Senator from Massachusetts, will deliver a Lecture, supplemental to the New York Anti-Slavery Society's Second Annual Course, in the Metropolitan Theatre (on the site of the late Metropolitan Hall), in Broadway, above Bleecker. Of this Lecture, already delivered in Boston, the *Liberator* says: "It was an able, generous and manly effort—making the anti-slavery cause paramount to all other interests or parties in the land. It was very warmly applauded." Admittance, 25 cents.

2. On Wednesday morning, May 9th, at 10 o'cl'k, in the Metropolitan Theatre, the American Anti-Slavery Society, as noticed elsewhere, will hold its Anniversary. The speaking on the occasion will, as in former years, no doubt, be of the highest order. The names of the orators will be announced hereafter. This meeting will be free to all.

3. On Wednesday evening, May 9th, at 7 3-4 o'clock, the Hon. CHARLES SUMNER will deliver, in the Metropolitan Theatre, a Lecture upon "The Necessity, Practicability and Dignity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, with Glimpses at the Practical Duties of the Free States." This Lecture, like Mr. Wilson's, will be supplemental to the Course of the New York Anti-Slavery Society. Admittance, 25 cents.

4. The American Anti-Slavery Society will meet in open Convention, for the transaction of its usual business and for general discussion, on Thursday, May 10th, at 9 1-2 o'clock, in the Free-will Baptist Church, in Sullivan street (west of Broadway, between Prince and Houston), and afterwards as may be determined by vote.

5. On Friday evening, May 11th, at the Broadway Tabernacle, the New York (City) Anti-Slavery Society will hold its Anniversary. Addresses by distinguished friends of the cause. Admittance, 12 1-2 cents, to defray expenses.

Never, we believe, in any former year, have the arrangements for anti-slavery meetings in Anniversary Week presented stronger inducements for a multitudinous gathering of the friends of the cause from every part of the country. The Metropolitan Theatre is hardly surpassed for size and elegance by any auditorium in the United States. We hope to see it crowded, on each occasion above specified, from the parquette to the uppermost gallery. The Freewill Baptist Church is light, spacious and convenient, and stands in a quiet street, easy of access. It is large enough to accommodate a pretty numerous audience.

##

LETTER FROM W. W. BROWN.

Correspondence of the Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW RICHMOND, Ohio, April 10, 1855.

AFTER lecturing, in most instances to large audiences, in a number of towns between New Lisbon and Massillon, I came on to Cincinnati, by way of Crestline and Dayton, over a new and rather ricketty railroad, which made me feel that although my head was insured, it was not entirely out of danger. The long journey was made pleasant by the fine weather and the sun pouring its effulgent beams of warmth and radiance over the fertile country through which we passed. When I inform you that it was at Cincinnati that I escaped from my old master, twenty-one years ago, you will believe me when I tell you that no language which I am master of can adequately describe the strange feelings with which I entered the Queen City of the West. How different the scene now! Twenty-one years ago, Cincinnati had only a population of about 35,000 or 40,000, now it numbers nearly 200,000 souls; then, many of its streets run through swamps and low lands; now, they are beautifully paved and will compare, in point of splendour, with some of our Eastern cities. In company with our friend W. W. Watson, I took a walk to the wharf, to view, once more, the spot where my old master's steamer lay when I leaped on shore, with an empty pocket but a full heart. A few buildings, still standing, enabled me to point out the identical place. The long string of steamers lying, apparently, as I saw them, when, with a throbbing heart and trembling limbs, I started for the land of *freedom*, carried me back to the days when I was a victim to the hydra-headed system that pollutes our moral atmosphere, and stigmatizes the national character, and proves ruinous to all that it touches. The lowness of the river brought me more to the Kentucky side, and the mean looking buildings in Covington, and its deserted streets, told too well the want of enterprise which slavery has entailed upon its inhabitants. In the afternoon of the same day, I strolled through the back part of the city, to see if I could recognise the place which was a marshy wood-land when I escaped, and in which I bid on the memorable day, until night-fall; but the swamp had disappeared, and where trees then stood, now are to be seen the beautiful brick dwellings with their green painted window-blinds. When I escaped, there was no Underground Railroad. The North Star was, in many instances, the only friend that the weary and foot-sore fugitive found on his pilgrimage to his new home amongst strangers, and, consequently, the means of getting away from slavery was not as easy then as now. During my first day at Cincinnati, the Rosetta slave-case was before the Court, and, although I did not see the girl, I saw her claimant, the Rev. H. M. Dennison, and the distinguished lawyers engaged in the suit on both sides. I was pleased with the appearance as well as the speech of ex-Senator Chase. Mr. Chase's successor (George Pugh, Esq.) was Dennison's counsel, and the Reverend slaveholder could not have secured a more devoted tool to the Slave Power than this newly-elected Senator from the State of Ohio. Mr. Pugh is of small stature, with a thin face and a receding forehead; hair, dark brown; nose, long; and eyes rather deeply set. He is a good lawyer, an eloquent speaker, but said to be a most unprincipled man. What a fall Ohio took when she elected this man to take the place of S. P. Chase. I met the Donaldsons, Blackwells and a few others of the slave's devoted friends there, and with whom I was much pleased. It was not intended for me to speak at Cincinnati until the Convention. But our coloured friends would not let me off, so I lectured in the Baker street Baptist church, Bishop Paine in the chair. The following day, Monday, I came to New Richmond, on board the steamboat Bostona, and lost my dinner, or rather failed to get it, because I would not eat with the *servants*. However, I enjoyed the trip, although hungry. One can scarcely pass through a more picturesque part of the country than when on a steamer gliding up or down the Ohio river. The beautiful valleys have been made to bloom, new arteries of commerce are filling up every avenue made vacant by the disappearance of the injured red men of the forest. Splendid mansions now sit where the Indian once roamed. The glorious scenery on both sides of the river, the soft and lovely valleys through which the waters of the Ohio linger, with a thousand coquettish wanderings, as if unwilling to leave, and upon whose bosom is here and there a splendid steamer with its steam and smoke curling towards the clouds, gives the whole an indescribable appearance.

A large meeting welcomed me to New Richmond, from which place I visited Laurel, Felicity and Bethel. You will remember that the latter town was the birth-place and residence of Thomas Morris, who first "bearded the lion in his den" at Washington, in his reply to Henry Clay. Mr. Morris lies buried in a sweet spot about a quarter of a mile from the town, where a beautiful monument, with a fitting inscription, points out his grave, and where, like watchful sentinels, the lofty trees stand around.

I have just had the pleasure of shaking the hand of another passenger by the Underground Railroad. He was a young man of fine appearance, and had with him an only child of eight months. The poor man's wife had been given to her young mistress, who was just married, and the young lady wanting the waiting-maid without the "incumbrance," as they say in Britain, the child and disconsolate husband were left behind; and the injured man was told to select another wife. However, he thought the surest way to guard against such another outrage, was to escape. But the determination not to leave his child behind, shows a degree of attachment that cannot be surpassed by the most refined and educated whites. His trembling voice, and eyes filled with the deepest emotion, while he related the story of his wrongs, was an index to a heart filled with the keenest grief. We cannot conceive of deeper, deadlier wrongs than these. There is but little doubt that this poor fugitive, ere this, is safe on the other side of Jordan. The anti-slavery feeling here, so near the slave territory, seems to be more favourable to Free Soil than Free Men. From the window where I am seated, I see the slave toiling on the Kentucky side of Mason and Dixon's Line. Nature could scarcely throw together more picturesque scenery than that which surrounds Frandon, the home of the Donaldsons, from which this is written. Situated in this lovely valley, with the murmuring Ohio running at the foot of the garden, I see the rafts and flat-bottomed boats floating down the river, with the children playing and "*roosters*" crowing on the tops. From present appearance, the coming Convention at Cincinnati, on the 25th, 26th and 27th of this month, will be well attended. The late slave-case has, no doubt, created a feeling in the Queen City of the West that will give additional interest to the cause at the approaching meeting.

Yours very truly, W. W. B.

SLAVERY.—The Baltimore Methodist Episcopal Conference, at a late meeting, two hundred members present, expressed their unanimous judgment by formal vote, that men, women and children may rightfully be bought, with an intention to enslave them, and that they may afterwards be held without reproach! Surely, blindness in part has happened to the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church. May God enlighten and forgive them. —*Boston Congregationalist.*

We beg to correct our Boston cotemporary. The Baltimore Conference belongs, not to the Church *South*, but to the Church *North*. Nay, more; of all the Conferences composing the Northern branch of the Church, it is the most influential. The representatives from the South on the floor of Congress are not more imperious and dictatorial in their bearing than are the delegates from that Conference in the highest judicatory of the Northern Methodist Church. And they always have their way. Just as the slaveholders rule the political parties, control nominations and dictate candidates to the North, so do the delegates of the Baltimore Conference, by the aid of pious doughfaces, control the editorship of the national Methodist organ, the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, placing it in the hands of subtle apologists for slavery, who use its columns to bolster up the institution, while they will not permit anything to be said on the other side. The more intelligent of the Methodist laity would gladly rid themselves of "the body of this death," but they are blinded and sold through the sorcery of sectarianism and priestcraft.

CUBA—RUMOURS OF WAR.

IT is confidently affirmed by Washington writers that the President has actually determined to pursue a policy which, he expects, will, within the next three months, lead to a war with Spain. The tone of the presses friendly to the Administration affords good ground for suspicion that this allegation is only too true. A correspondent of the *Evening Post*, who has been warned, as a business man, to prepare himself for the catastrophe, sends to that journal the following intelligence, derived from an officer of the United States army who professed to have been advised with, upon the matter to which it relates, and which gives plausibility, if not probability to the rumour above referred to. He says:

"While the difficulties with Spain were most promising of trouble, under the Soulé regime, our Government quietly concentrated several thousand troops in Florida, convenient for embarkation, and actually loaded one or two sailing vessels with heavy guns and ammunition, and had them ready near at hand. The port in Cuba was selected at which they were to land.

"The plan was, with the regulars, to run across to this port, which could be done in a few hours, surprise and seize it, throw up earthworks with all speed to defend the position by land, with fleet sufficient to keep the port open. Thus situated they were to call for volunteers, and ten to fifteen thousand would arrive in a week, self-armed, and of the fiercest quality. They were then to move with all despatch upon the principal point of the island. Quitman and some others were in the secret. This was the programme.

"Such was the position of affairs when that singular rumour came up that the cabinet had changed its policy, and henceforth was to be pacific. Whether this last proposition was a further ruse, a mere blind, the result must show. One thing seems certain—the Government does not show the expected activity in respect to the Sioux campaign. They are tardy about it. Only some 12 or 1400 troops are yet assembled at Jefferson Barracks, and it may be that the new regiments will have another destination yet.

"The fire-eaters are doubtless quickened by the proposition to improve the condition of the slave population on the Island. My own opinion is, that the cabinet is convinced that nothing but a republican *coup d' etat* can save them from the fate of Tylerites. Pierce is good-natured, and will go over, sure, with a strong south wind."

It is said that the President has ordered a fleet to the Gulf of Mexico, under command of Com. McCauley, with instructions to capture or sink any Spanish war craft that may presume to board any American vessel in search of Fillibusters. The *Times* thinks this will not lead to war. We shall see.

Meanwhile, the Governor-General of Cuba is preparing for the worst. He has recently organized eight companies of militia, to be composed of free mulattoes, and eight companies more, to be composed of free blacks. Says a correspondent of the *Tribune*, "This raising the black and coloured races, even to the grade of soldiers, cannot but tend to liberate them, and, as I have, I believe, before observed, must hasten the period when the entire African race in Cuba will be free; because the arming and disciplining men who have friends and relatives held as slaves, although *they* are themselves free, renders them better able to assist their relatives held in bonds." The same writer adds: "I am fully convinced that the mere declaration of war by the United States against Spain, or, at least, the appearance of the first United States soldier on these shores, would have the effect of setting free all the slaves—so, for the sake of the miserably oppressed Africans and their descendants, let even war come!—war, with all its horrors, being less terrible than slavery's pangs."

A NEW SOCIETY.

WE learn from William Goodell's *American Jubilee* that a Society was organized in this city, on the 5th inst., called *The Abolition Society of New York City and Vicinity*. Its distinguishing features may be inferred from the following resolution, adopted at a preliminary meeting of the friends of the movement:

"Resolved, That slavery is contrary to the law of God, and incapable of being established or sustained by human enactments; that American slavery, moreover, is inconsistent with the Declaration of Independence, and *contrary to the Constitution of the United States; and, therefore, it is the duty of the people, through the Federal Government or otherwise, immediately to abolish the whole system.*"

The doctrines of this resolution are elaborated and applied, in various particulars, in the Constitution, and still more fully in an Address to the People of the United States. One of the Society's "leading sentiments" is thus expressed:

"It is the duty of Christians to hold no Church relations that involve religious fellowship or ecclesiastical connection with slaveholders. It is also their duty to sustain no Missionary Society having complicity with slaveholding, nor any Tract Society, or other religious publishing Society that does not expose and rebuke the heinous sin of slaveholding, in common with other sins."

The terms of membership are thus defined:

"Any person approving these objects, principles and measures, and pledged to their support, by effort and example, may become a member of this Society by enrolling his name and contributing to its funds."

Women, it seems, are not to be allowed to become members. They will be graciously permitted, probably, to "help the cause along" in such ways as are not deemed inconsistent with proper subordination to the other sex nor with the "usages of society." The spirit of the defection of 1840 is herein exhibited.

The officers of the Society are as follows, viz.: Lewis Tappan, President; *James M'Cune Smith, (!!)* Vice President; W. E. Whiting, Treasurer; Wm. Goodell, Secretary. Executive Committee, in addition to the preceding, Simeon S. Jocelyn, I. R. Barbour, Samuel Wilde, Geo. Whipple, Wm. H. Pillow, Charles B. Ray, John W. Hill, Wm. T. Dawley, Hez. D. Sharpe, G. S. Wells.

Lewis Tappan, we believe, is a recent convert to the Spooner doctrine. He was the leader of the New Organization in 1840, and has done his worst, from that day till now, to destroy the influence of the American Anti-Slavery Society, both in this country and Great Britain, by propagating the falsehood that that Society is under the guidance of infidels. The animus of a Society, of which *he* is to be the presiding genius, in all that pertains to Old Organized Anti-Slavery, it needs no special sagacity to infer; but if there were any room for charitable doubt in the case, a glance at the name of its Vice President would be quite sufficient to obviate it.

☞ As some of our readers, in this State, will like to see the vote by which "the Act for the better preservation of the Constitutional rights and liberties of the people of this State" was defeated, we subjoin the yeas and nays:

YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Beecher, J. Bennett, J. P. Bennett, Belyea, Blakeslee, Blatchford, Boynton, Brush, Bushnell, Edwards, Clark, E. Cole, Comstock, Davidson, Donnan, Eames, Everest, Fairchild, Fitch, Gleason, Jummerson, C. P. Johnson, Knapp, Kirkland, Leigh, Littlefield, Lourie, Machan, Main, Masters, May, E. Miller, Munro, Paine, D. Palmer, Platt, Ramsay, Raymond, Rickerson, Rhode, Robinson, Schuyler, B. Smith, Speaker, Stebbins, Stuyvesant, Terhune, G. Tompkins, L Tompkins, Van Osdol, Warner, Walker, Weed, G. D. Williams, Wilsey, Wooden—58.

NAYS—Messrs. Aitken, Allen, Bridenbecker, Buckley, Cocks, S. B. Cole, Conger, Covey, Devening, Dixon, Emans, Ferdon, Gates, Hull, Ivans, Kendig, McLaughlin, L. Miller, Mundy, Odell, O'Keefe, F. W. Palmer, Peck, Petty, Phelps, Rhodes, Seagrist, Seymour, Smalley, E. L. Smith, J. A. Smith, W. B. Smith, Stanton, Storrs, Ward, Waterbury, E. S. Whalen, A. G. Williams, Wygant —39.

Mr. Phelps changed his vote from the affirmative to the negative, in order to move a reconsideration, and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Foreign Correspondence.

From Our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, March 29, 1855.

SUCH a winter as we have had—such harsh east winds and so many of them—such snow, so long on the ground—and such frost, so intense and so persistent. The like has not happened for forty years at least. The early part of January was so comparatively mild that we thought the winter was about to give us the slip. But then came the harsh, damp, chilly weather that soaks into the bones, producing rheumatism and misery in twenty shapes. I could never, until this winter, understand how our American visitors could prefer their own climate, with its extremes of heat and cold, to our more temperate dispensation. But I can now sympathize with all who abhor damp, chilly, foggy, penetrating amosphere, and prefer to take the chance of being occasionally fried and frozen instead. In February, winter came in all his attributes of frost and snow. We had the ground covered with snow for four or five weeks. In some parts of the country, the drifts were ten and fifteen and, I am told, a great many more feet deep. The rivers and canals were frozen, and even Lough Neagh, our greatest fresh-water lake, was frozen across for two miles from the shore to the only island that adorns its surface. There was never such skating and sliding, and we even had sleighs in the streets, with bells and buffalo robes, all quite proper. This was a great change from our comparatively mild winters. In Ireland, we rarely have more than an occasional slight fall of snow, to the depth of a few inches. Neither frost nor snow is apt to last more than two or three days; and when you see skates offered for sale, you may, as a general rule, confidently look for a thaw next day. It was not so, however, this time. The thermometer was down many degrees below zero, the water froze in many bed chambers, the railways were obstructed, the mails delayed, and we had most of the attributes of a Canadian winter, on a small scale. People are apt to say that the weather in summer is not so warm, nor the frost in winter so pleasant, as it was in their early days; and I confess that the feathery flowers and trees worked by the frost in our window panes did not seem to me at all equal to those I used to see when I lived with my grandmother. The poor suffered very much from the sudden stop put to many kinds of out-of-door employment; very many aged people were cut off during the severe weather; and among the minor disasters attendant on a very low temperature, so much prolonged, was the destruction of a vast quantity of evergreens and green-house plants. Many of our American visitors have expressed great surprise and admiration at the beauty and luxuriance of our ivies, bays, laurels, and other evergreens, and I have heard them speak of the difficulty with which they are reared in the United States. I suppose the excessive cold of your winters is the cause, for it is melancholy, wherever you go in your walks round Dublin, to see the brown and blasted aspect of the beautiful shrubs and creepers that ornament our (not my, for I have no) pleasure grounds or clothe ancient and venerable ruins.

Of the war that made such a stir when it commenced, and was ushered in with so much boasting, we hear very little. When it commenced, a very general delusion prevailed (by which I was deluded as much as anybody), that it would, somehow or other, lead to the relief of the down-trodden and oppressed nations of Europe, and that a stop would be put to the aggression of Russia for some time to come. As far as I was able to judge, this war differed from all the former wars into which England has plunged from time to time. The people seemed more desirous than the government to enter into it, and no pains were taken to undeceive them in their confident expectations that, in the struggle, their continental brethren would find a chance of greatly improving their condition. I fear this expectation is at an end. It is said that France and England have guaranteed the integrity of the Austrian empire, and all propositions for the restoration of Poland that have been made in Parliament and elsewhere have been received by our government with little favour. Probably they could not restore Poland if they would, and that they would not if they could. The other day, our clever and thoroughly unprincipled and time-serving Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston, roundly declared that it was well known that Hungary was essential to the existence of the Austrian empire as a great power in the central parts of Europe, and that this had always been the opinion of Government, who had, therefore, no desire to disturb the arrangement. During the troubles of 1848, the popular feeling in England was manifestly on the side of the insurgent nations, whilst the aristocracy and wealthier and conservative classes plainly showed, by the expressive language of silence, that they disliked any successful resistance to constituted authority. It is my theory that the English nobles, who, in nineteen cases out of twenty, pull the strings in all the movements of our foreign policy, dread any improvement in the state of the people of Europe which might throw discredit upon their own ascendancy in England; and that the cruelty and horrors of the French reign of terror are an immense obstruction to the progress of liberty, since they act as a perpetual bugbear to the ruling and influential classes, who apprehend that what has happened before may happen again, and that it is, therefore, better "to let well enough alone." It is true that the human race is essentially the same, possessing the same elements of virtue and vice, in all ages. The world has never seen a more terrible, fanatical, determined, all-pervading tyrant than the late Emperor Nicholas. And amongst the Legrees on your plantations, and the wife-beaters in the purlieus of London, there are wretches as ferocious as ever disgraced humanity.

I do not believe the popular ideas about this war with Russia are very definite at present. The English would like to have something effected to show that their enormous outlay in blood and treasure has not been altogether in vain. If this were done, they would probably be glad to have peace back again, with prosperous trade and a reduced income tax. The depression in trade, with the attendant suffering to the poorer classes, has been, unquestionably, very great since the war began. By some, this has been attributed entirely to the war; by others, to over-trading and the prodigious and extravagant speculative exportation to our Australian colonies; by a third class, to the disturbed relations with the United States, in consequence of commercial difficulties there. Most probably these have all had their influence, and that, when peace returns, and the Australians have had time to use up our exports at half or quarter price, and things come round to a healthy state with you, we shall have tolerable trade and greater prosperity, till another of those intermittent panics turns up which seem to be a part of the normal state of things in every community of *English* origin. I will not say *Anglo-Saxon*, to please you. That word has become very much of a cant in the United States. I am sure, if the few barbarous Anglos that came over from Holstein with Hengist and Horsa (or some short time before or after) could have had a vision of the forty or fifty millions who are set down as their descendants, they would have had as much reason to be astounded as was Abraham when the future glories of his race were spread before him in the revelations of prophecy.

The *Anti-Slavery Standard* has just come to hand containing Gerrit Smith's letter to Wendell Phillips, which I have read with deep interest and great pleasure. If, as may be inferred from this letter, Wendell Phillips ascribes the abolition of our West Indian slavery to our aristocratic institutions, I do not agree with him. The abolition of slavery was effected in England after a very long struggle with both royalty and aristocracy. It is said that George the Third hated Clarkson, and looked on his efforts for the abolition of the slave trade as arising from sympathy with the French revolutionists, many of the most distinguished of whom, including, I think, Robespierre and Lafayette, were associated as "Amis du Noirs." The same Duke of Clarence who ridiculed Wilberforce and Clarkson, in his place in the House of Lords, was the William IV. who, as King, gave his assent to the Bill for the Abolition of British Slavery. Former Bills for the same object had been repeatedly thrown out by the House of Lords after the Commons had passed them. This was essentially a middle class movement in England, and received little countenance from the aristocratic and great moneyed classes, who are, in the nature of things, conservative of all institutions by which power and money are secured in the hands of a few. I not only agree with Gerrit Smith that the American reformers will not suffer in any fair comparison with the reformers of England, but I think the American Abolitionists, at least, have had a much greater work to do, and have attempted it and persevered in it in the teeth of difficulties such as no English reformer has had to contend with. Whatever branch of reform a man advocates in England, unless he attempt to attain it in some violent way, he is sure of followers, admiration and sympathy. He runs no real danger, and incurs no greater loss than that to which every one must submit who prefers to devote his time to something else than the accumulation of money. Gerrit Smith is right when he asserts that the hatred of slavery, on the part of those who do hate it in America, is more intense and self-sacrificing than that of the English reformers. Your Abolitionists have gone to the root of the matter. Their hatred is founded upon principle and upon actual knowledge of what they have to contend with. Here it is too often a mere sentiment, which is generally impotent against the claims of sect or the test of new circumstances. I never admired the habit some Abolitionists have of pointing to England by way of shaming America, for I know how little we have to boast of. The most that such a comparison can prove is, that if people be not surrounded by corrupting circumstances and dangerous temptations, they will not act as basely and as wickedly as those who are not so fortunate. Of the British settlers in the United States, whether for purposes of commerce, agriculture, or maintenance in other ways, the proportion is exceedingly small who do not act precisely as the Americans themselves do under the same circumstances. They are just as time-serving, just as pro-slavery. And of those who take part in anti-slavery efforts here, I fear the proportion is very small who would not act in the same accommodating way if they emigrated to the United States. From the commencement of my own interest in your cause, I have been astonished, in the opportunity afforded at London Anti-Slavery Meetings, Conventions and Conferences, at the ignorance respecting Abolitionists which prevailed amongst the members, and their slight apprehension of the demands of the cause in your country. Earnest Garrisonian Abolitionism in America has led to a sounding of principles, a testing of pretensions, an exposing of shams, such as our limited English experience cannot compare with. With the single exception of Clarkson, we can show no man who has devoted heart and soul, time, talents, and prospects in life, facing danger, defying opposition, lavishing means, resisting despair, and relying, with unshaken faith, upon the ultimate triumph of principle, like many, very many high-souled men and women amongst the American Abolitionists. If all who have, from time to time, claimed the title of Abolitionist *had* been such as these, I do not question that the victory would have been won by this time. But it would be as reasonable to expect that every poetaster should turn out a Shakspeare, or every mechanic a Watts, as that every one who abhors slavery and wishes for its overthrow should evince the perseverance and fervour of Phillips Look through a nation, and you will hardly find another man precisely parallel to Gerrit Smith, with his noble devotedness of great wealth, his self-reliance, his great talents so freely laid on the altar of every good cause. It rarely rains great men; and if greatness be measured by the union of great moral qualities with fine intellectual endowments and a grand opportunity nobly employed, I do not know when or where we should look for a more plentiful show of them than is presented by the United States at the present time.

Gerrit Smith admits that the movement to abolish American slavery is a failure. This is so far true that slavery is not yet abolished. So Christianity is a failure, since, after an experiment of eighteen hundred years, only a very infinitesimal fraction of the world is yet truly reformed or converted. Rome was not built in a day; and considering the immense numerical disproportion between the working Abolitionists and the millions they have essayed to influence, they have done great things, which will be, must be, felt in all coming time.

The objections to the Abolitionists so often made to them by others, and so insisted on by Mr. Smith, that they are sectarian, that they differ in their choice of means, that they misunderstand and misrepresent one another, must, perhaps, be admitted; but every one who allows for difference of training and circumstances must see that such differences are inevitable, and that it is vain to hope that sects can be brought to an end until people learn to stand clear, mentally as well as physically, or that differences will cease so long as human beings differ in age, circumstances, temperament, and endowment. The most we can fairly look for is that people shall try to agree to differ.

Mr. Smith's testimony to the unselfish and independent moral position of the Garrison Abolitionists is most valuable, as coming from a disinterested witness, who does not claim to be of the number of those he commends.

The most important part of his letter, in my opinion, is that in which he protests against admissions made to the Slave Power, in favour of the constitutionality of slavery, by the most eminent anti-slavery members of Congress, including Chase, Sumner, Giddings, Seward and others. Their conduct was good as far as it went, and their words full of power and eloquence, but still they only cried "Stand off!" to the slaveholders. They did not dispute their legal claim to their property in human flesh, nor their right to recover fugitives, provided that right was legally asserted. Their conduct has been marked by the shuffling, evasion and want of success inseparable from a false position, and I am glad that we have this admission in such excellent testimony as that of Gerrit Smith.

It is a very general opinion now that if Clarkson and his British compeers had commenced their warfare with Slavery instead of the Slave Trade, the final victory would have been more speedily and effectually accomplished. But Policy, Compromise and Expediency are ever chasing shadows, that evermore lure them to their ruin.

Until I read this letter of Gerrit Smith, I never could understand his advocacy of the annexation of Cuba as an anti-slavery instrumentality; nor has he now explained how he would, consistently with his peace principles and his abhorrence of the fillibustering spirit of the South, propose that this annexation should be achieved. It is one thing to rejoice that the cunning shall be caught in their own craftiness, and another to assist in promoting their schemes. Whenever a man of unimpeachable character points out the benefits likely to arise from an iniquitous project, I see no harm in his taking some pains to show that he has no sympathy with the scoundrels who advocate it for objects of their own. I am glad to see there are so many plausible reasons for hoping that the slaveholders are likely to burn their fingers by the acquisition of Cuba—which, as they have set their hearts upon it, it has now become the fashion to believe they will, therefore, attain.

I do not know whether Mr. Smith's logic, that as every man is an Abolitionist for himself, therefore every man is an Abolitionist, will hold good. Every man is or means to be benevolent to himself, but every man is not, therefore, benevolent. The world is full of people who think, or think they think, that what is very good for themselves, and very pleasant, would be exceedingly noxious for other people. I remember hearing a plump, rosy, well-fed Church of England parson say that "commas were very good for the poor"—helping them on in their halting progress along the paths of learning; though I suppose he would not like to have them so thickly strewn for his own reading. And so with slaveholders and despots of all kinds. But Wendell Phillips is very well able to answer the letters he receives without my assistance. And so, farewell.

Yours, RICHARD D. WEBB.

ILLINOIS IMPROVING.—Illinois has hitherto stood the worst upon the record as regards fugitive slaves and free coloured people, surrounding the condition of the one with every possible disability, and throwing every obstacle in the way of the escape of the other. It is disposed, however, now to take a step in the other direction, and to extend some protection by law to the freeman. The Legislature, at its late session, passed a law, making it the duty of the Governor, on receiving satisfactory information that any inhabitant of the State has been decoyed, kidnapped, or transported away from the State into any other State or Territory of the United States, for the purpose of restraining such person in his or her liberty, or reducing such person to slavery, or any other unlawful purpose, or that such person is wrongfully seized, imprisoned, or held in slavery in any of the States or Territories of the United States, on the allegation or pretence that such a person is a slave, or by colour of any usage or rule of law prevailing in such State or Territory is deemed or taken to be a slave, or not entitled of right to the personal liberty of an inhabitant of Illinois, it shall be the duty of the Governor to take such measures as he shall deem necessary to procure such person to be restored to his or her liberty, and returned to this State. The Governor is hereby authorized to appoint such agent or agents as he shall deem necessary to effect the restoration and return of such person, and shall furnish said agent with such credentials and instructions as will be likely to accomplish the object of his appointment. The expenses incurred in such rescue or recovery are to be paid out of the State Treasury.

The Law, we presume—for we have not yet seen it in full—provides also for the punishment of the kidnapper; or that penalty, perhaps, is provided for by some other statute. In that case some protection is given incidentally to the fugitive as well as to the free coloured man. So Illinois, this year, has done better than our own State. She has done one good act but said little. New York has talked much but done only evil.

For the Anti-Slavery Standard.

ADDRESS

TO THE AMERICANS OF THE UNITED STATES ON THEIR REPORTED WANT OF SYMPATHY.

"AM I my brother's keeper?" says the New World to the Old;
It cannot be—it cannot be, your heart has grown so cold.
That ye will hear, without one sigh, the dirge across the wave,
For England's bravest sons who found on eastern shores a grave.

Has every drop of Saxon blood been chas'd from out your veins?
Are not our ancient glories *yours*, altho' ye scorned our chains?
E'en then ye prov'd *one* Ancestry—a kindred bond of yore—
With those bold men of Runnymede, who Freedom's Charter bore.

O by that name, by every field our noble Fathers won,
Ere yet your fearless bark of Faith had sought the western sun,
Disown not now the common cause, betray it not to Might,
Nor dare to show a Neutral flag when Wrong contends with Right.

Summary.

Hon. John M. Niles, late Postmaster-General and U. S. Senator, has published a masterly argument in favour of the constitutionality of the Maine Law of Connecticut.

The Unitarian Association has sent a missionary to India, the Rev. C. H. A. Dall, the first foreign missionary ever sent by this denomination. Mr. Dall's object is rather one of exploration than of permanent occupancy.

We hear that a younger son of Judge Kane, of Philadelphia, Dr. John K. Kane, who has recently graduated with the highest honours at the University (medical) of Pennsylvania, is to go out as the surgeon of one of the ships of the expedition, so soon to start for the Arctic seas, in search of the unfortunate expedition of his elder brother.—*Washington Star, April* 10.

Mr. Wm. R. Prince offers to place $200 in the hands of Mr. Horace Greeley, and then have a public debate in this city between Rev. Theodore Parker and Rev. Dr. R. S. Foster, the latter preacher having made it a practice, in some of his winter-lectures, of selecting Mr. Parker as the topic of his remarks, and—as Mr. Prince thinks—greatly misrepresenting the views of the Boston theologian. The disposition of the money is to be decided by the votes of the audience, after the debate.

AN OLD SERMON.—The correspondent of the *Christian Inquirer*, who recently attended a Quaker meeting in Philadelphia, says of it:

"Our sermon was more ancient than the one recently re-preached in Lynn, by Rev. Mr. Cooke. That was preached to the same church 200 years ago. Ours was older than the creation. Silence was the text, silence was the preacher, silence was the sermon. The belief of the Friends is, that silent worship is often quite as useful and improving to their spirits as the most eloquent preaching."

A FINE PAINTING.—The Cincinnati papers are commending in the highest terms a new panorama, called Ball's Pictorial Tour of the United States, which is now on exhibition there. It is a mammoth painting, containing upwards of 28,000 square feet of canvass, and delineating Southern Life, Scenery, and Institutions, in contrast with Northern. Mr. Ball, the proprietor, is a Daguerrean Artist of Cincinnati, and a coloured man. By his superior artistic talents, and his untiring enterprize, he has succeeded in amassing a liberal fortune. He has spent several thousand dollars on this great enterprise, and has succeeded in producing a work alike commendable in design, and beautiful in execution. We are informed that it will be exhibited in Boston in a few weeks.

In selecting the materials for our forthcoming work on Slaveholding Literature, we cannot refrain from copying the following letter which appears in the Cleveland *Herald*:

"CINCINNATI, March 27, 1855.

"*Messrs. Editors Herald*:

"You publish an editorial in your edition of the 24th concerning Mr. Dennison. In reply to which I beg leave to inform the whole of you, that you are a set of DAMNED ABOLITIONIST PUSILLANIMOUS WHITE-LIVERED SCOUNDRELS, RASCALS and LIARS. I shall hold myself personally responsible for the above. Perhaps you will publish this, if you do, let me beg of you to give it a colouring consistent with your character of *damned* rascals. Yours, truly,

"GEORGE T. ATKINS."

STREET MUSICIANS.—From an elaborate article in the *Tribune*, we gather some facts in relation to this almost unnoticed portion of our population. It is estimated by one of their number, that there are not less than a thousand employed at present in this and other cities. They are migratory in their habits, usually spending the winter in the more southern cities and returning to the North in summer. They are divided into two parties, the Italians and the Germans, who have a strong dislike to each other, and so occupy different localities in the city. They are cheerful, honest in their dealings with each other, and many of them live in quite a cleanly and comfortable way in their one room. As a class, they care little for the country of their adoption, but delight in perpetuating the customs of their own land. Though there is a constant emigration from Italy, the Italians here do not much increase in numbers as their children rarely live and thrive in this climate.

THE EXTENT OF THE LATE CESSIONS OF THE INDIANS, WEST OF THE MISSOURI, &C.—Under the treaties made by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with various tribes, in the last year or so, the United States have obtained lands from the Indians located west of the Missouri and the Missouri State line, as follows: From the Omahas, about 600,000,000 acres; Ottoes and Missourians, 3,000,000 acres; Shawnees, 1,600,000 acres; Delawares, 275,000 acres; Sacs and Foxes, 435 000 acres; Kickapoos, 768,000 acres; Iowas, 125,000 acres; Kackaskias and others, 94,000 acres; and from the Miamis, 325,000 acres. Individual reservations are provided for in these treaties, and also some portions of the lands above mentioned are to be sold for the benefit of the Indians ceding them. This is the case with the Delawares' lands. Such lands are not subject to be squatted on, as this Government cannot, by act of Congress, assign lands held in trust to be disposed of for the benefit of others, to squatters.—*Washington Star.*

RELIGIOUS DESTITUTION IN THE SOUTH.—A colporteur writing to a Southern religious journal, says:

"The spiritual desolations of the South are more prevalent than is generally supposed. There are, as you know, comparatively few towns and villages. The population is widely dispersed. Many thousands of white families are too remote from places of worship to listen steadily to the preaching of the gospel, while public worship is too infrequent in the country districts to furnish adequate instruction to those who desire it. A colporteur in North Carolina found more than 500 out of 2,000 families visited in his native county destitute of the Scriptures: and more than 600 families uniformly neglected the church. In another county, the colporteurs visited 13,000 souls, and found the belief of witchcraft, charms, and conjurers, nearly universal, and his statement was confirmed by a clergyman and editor, of this city, who had visited the county two successive seasons."

MR. WEBSTER CHALLENGED BY JOHN RANDOLPH.—The correspondent of the New York *Evening Post*, who has been attending the sale at Marshfield, says:

"During the time of South Carolina nullification, so great was the excitement in Congress that almost every northern Congressman, with the exception of Mr. Webster, wore arms. He himself was vastly amused when, one day at a dinner party in his house, a dozen members of Congress, including in the number Mr. Edward Everett, whom he had invited as guests, came to him in great trepidation, each one supplied with a brace of pistols, asking him for a drawer for their safe keeping during the entertainment.

"In 1816, Mr. Webster's courage was tested by a challenge, of which, I believe, Mr. Benton was the bearer, from John Randolph, of Roanoke, who had taken umbrage at some remarks made by the former on the sugar tax.

"His reply was short, but courageous and to the point, declining the challenge, denying the right of Randolph to demand an explanation, but declaring his ability and purpose to punish any one who should in any way 'presume upon the fact of his refusal' to fight a duel. Mr. Benton subsequently wrote to Mr. Webster, requesting the publication of the correspondence, but the permission was withheld. Further letters passed between them on this matter so late as the year 1850, which are still preserved among the Webster papers."

AN IMPORTANT HISTORICAL DISCOVERY.—Some two or three weeks since, we announced, through our columns, the preparation of a History of Massachusetts, by Rev. Mr. Barry, of Hanover, which is now in the hands of the printer. We were informed confidentially at that time, that Mr. Barry had made the discovery of some valuable manuscripts relating to the early history of the State, and are now happy to be able to add that yesterday afternoon, at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, an official announcement was made of Mr. Barry's discovery. This discovery is no less than the long-lost manuscript history of the Plymouth Colony, written by Governor Bradford, which was in the hands of Prince, when he prepared his New England Chronology, and of Hutchinson, when he wrote his History of Massachusetts. This document is in England, and a copy of the same is soon expected in this country for publication.—*Boston Journal, April* 13.

A miner, who had been much respected, died some time since at the California diggings, and it was determined to give him a regular funeral. A digger in the vicinity, who, report said, had once been a powerful preacher in the United States, was called upon to officiate; and after "drinks all round," the party proceeded, with becoming gravity, to the grave, which had been dug at a distance of a hundred yards from the camp. When this spot was reached, the officiating minister commenced with an extempore prayer, during which all knelt round the grave. So far was well; but the prayer was unnecessarily long, and at last some of those who knelt began, in an abstracted way, to finger the loose earth that had been thrown up from the grave. It was thick with gold, and an excitement was immediately apparent in the kneeling crowd. Upon this the preacher stopped, and inquiringly said, 'Boys, what's that? Gold!" he continued, "and the richest kind of diggings—the congregation are dismissed!" The poor miner was taken from his auriferous grave, and was buried elsewhere, while the funeral party, with the parson at their head, lost no time in prospecting the new digging.

THEODORE PARKER'S PREPARATIONS FOR MARTYRDOM.—We are informed that the Rev. Theodore Parker, in his discourse yesterday, alluded to the proceedings in the United States Court last week. He said he never believed the trial could go on. Singularly enough, it was first appointed for the day which formed the eighty-fifth anniversary of the Boston Massacre. He remarked, that looking at his own case in its worst aspect, he had made arrangements with two persons to stand in his desk and deliver the sermons written by himself in jail, and had also arranged with the New York *Tribune* to publish the same immediately after their delivery.

It is quite evident that those arraigned before the United States Court, whose offences were "*constructive*" only, are greatly disappointed at the breach made in the indictments by Judge Curtis, through which they walked free. From the moment they were indicted, invitations poured in upon them to address Literary Societies, Lyceums and Young Men's Associations in all the free States, and unless the postages to the hundreds of places where they declined invitations, offset the profits received where they gave addresses, they have made a good thing of it. It rather pays to be a martyr.—*Bost. Trans., April* 16.

A TOTAL WRECK.—On the 1st of January, 1854, a gentleman doing business in this city, was worth, with what he had invested in business, $110,000. At the same time he was blessed with a lovely and intelligent wife, beautiful and promising children. He was surrounded by friends who esteemed and respected him. His business was lucrative, and promised to continue so. Indeed, his position as well as his prospects were, seemingly, all that he could desire to render his happiness perfect. How complete the wreck which the year closed upon! The first misfortune was the transfer of merchandise to the amount of $18,000 to a California dealer, for which not one cent was ever received. The next were two successive robberies, by

Miscellaneous Department.

OUR CINDERELLA.

It needed no second glance, when we first employed Our Cinderella, to discover that she was a real indigenous London plant, that had grown in some stifling court, where the sun, when it shines there at all, only reveals hot beds of filth, while what little air enters, just stirs up the poisonous gasses which cannot escape, to float into the houses, and be inhaled by the short-lived and fever-fed inhabitants. She was one of that class of precocious children, who, at the first look, can pick out the largest fried fish, the biggest ha'porth of damaged fruit, or through intricate windings and arched passages lead you direct, in the dark, to the low public-house that gives a farthing change out of the penny paid for half a pint of beer. She seemed as if she had never been properly a simple child, but had come into the world with her little head filled with strange cunning notions, which caused her to begin to think seriously as soon as she was born. She was never sent to school, saving when her mother went out to a day's cleaning in winter; then she was turned into a little back-room in the court, and left, like others of her class, to the care of a deaf old woman, with a piece of dry bread and a drink of water when the pipe that supplied the whole court was not frozen, for, as her mother said, "the twopence a a week she paid came cheaper than leaving her with a bit of fire." In fine weather, however, she was always left free to run anywhere.

Before she was selected to fill our vacant Cinderellaship, she had, to use her own words, "been out to nu'ss Mrs. Smith's baby for her wittles; then she lit the fires and fitched the gin and beer for the washerwoman at the laundry; after that she was kept to answer the door, run errands, and clean a bit at a lodging-house; but she caught sich a cold through washing up in the damp cellar, that she could n't do the work, and so they paid her half a week's wages (which was threepence), and sent her home." She introduced herself with a single knock at the door, and a "Please do you want a girl to help, clean, or anything?" Her earnest-looking eyes, and "plain unvarnished tale," were her greatest recommendation. There are many patient and painstaking people in the world that spend weeks in teaching a parrot to talk, or a dog to play a few fantastic tricks, who would have been driven to their wits' end before they had given Our Cinderella a week's trial. We thought her of more value than many Polls and Pugs; and making patience a duty, and endurance the test of fulfilling it, encouraged her at times to talk, and gathered information from her conversation, and knowledge from her shrewd tricks, far more instructive and amusing to ourselves than we ever could have got from bird or beast.

She made her first appearance in her mother's old bonnet and shawl; and when her offer was accepted, she uttered her "thank you kindly" with such a cheerful lighting up of her old-fashioned intelligent countenance, as to draw the eye away from her rough unkempt hair and dirty neck and shoulders, so suddenly revealed, when she threw off those outward trappings, and stood with her lanky long arms eager, ready and willing to do her utmost to earn an honest penny. What a contrast she was to the little haughty minx, who with the curtain of her bonnet lowered to the very nape of her bit of a neck, and her nose pointing up like a chicken's beak after it has drunk, had with a swing, a bounce, and a slam of the door, vacated her Cinderellaship the week before, "bekawse she could n't have a 'dayr' to herself to go to Green'ich Fair!" Our new girl did, indeed, rub and scrub in her peculiar way—sweeping and washing the space occupied by a chair, then dusting the latter and replacing it so that by the time she had finished her dustings and sweepings, the old dirt had settled down upon the furniture as quietly as if it had never been disturbed. Then her poor rent shoes, which, "a world too wide," were ever coming off; and sometimes the tap of the water-butt would be pouring into one, while she was scouring away in some corner with the other on, utterly unconscious of her loss; and when told of it, would only reply with "I's allers been hewsed to having my feet wet, and don't feel it." She had never heard of any objection to using the same towel to wipe up the plates and dishes as she dried her hands and face with, to say nothing of her neck, which, when at home, she washed once a week, for Our Cinderella was very regular in her way. Her stockings were at first always falling about her feet, and she trod as softly over the floor as a feather-footed bantam-fowl, while the tops covered the unsightly holes in the heels. At her first experiment in cookery, she dressed the potatoes in the kettle; and when the sauce-pans were pointed out, she said "she allers biled the taturs in the kittle at home, and wrinched it out a'rter before she put in the tea-water; and so did her mother."

Nearly everything which would take the impression, was for a long time stamped with Cinderella, "her mark;" there were traces of her little, industrious and dirty fingers on the table-cloth, in the butter and sugar, on the bread, on the new bonnet and shawl of her mistress, which she had been trying on to see how she looked in them; for she would use her fingers to scrape up the cinders, and as to putting on the old gloves that were given to her for the purpose while she scoured the pots and pans, she fairly laughed at the proposition as a joke and put them away somewhere to be worn on Sunday. Having herself suffered cold, hunger and every other privation, she was always an urgent pleader for the beggars that knocked at the door; and her "Oh, please, there's sich a poor'oman, with a dear sweet babby in her arms, so like our little Ellen, and she only axes for a bit of bread; and they do look so hungry, please," never failed to soften us, though we knew the woman would exchange the broken victuals for gin. The rapidity, however, with which Our Cinderella flew to execute her glad mission, and the hearty kiss she gave the child at the door, outbalanced the canting whine of the old imposter.

After we had altered an old bonnet, and made it to fit her, almost the first thing she brought out of her trifling wages was a staring read wreath of cotton flowers with which to decorate it; and when we offered to trim it with neat ribbon, if she would throw the artificial abomination away, she consented; but on inquiry, we found that she had sold it, like a true child of the court, to another Cinderella for threepence, which, she said, "was better than losing the whole shilling."

She had to be reminded many times before we could get her to fasten more than one button at the back of her frock; for though her little bare skinny back was exposed, she seemed unconscious of the cold air the opening admitted. It was also a long and difficult task to persuade her to fasten her shawl when she went out; if it blew off, she picked it up and threw it again over her shoulders, regardless of the weather or the state of the pavement, for, as she said, "she had allers been used to holding it, and *fiveses* (fingers) was made before pins."

What an eventful day that was in the life of our Cinderella, when we presented her with a five-shilling rosewood work-box, which had a little looking-glass fitted into the inside of the lid. She danced, "oh my'd," and "well I nevered," as she made some new discovery in the intricacies of the pink cotton lining, clapped her hands, and seemed half-frantic with delight; and then to be her own too?—to keep?—to do what she liked with? This ascertained, she said, "she would be so good;" then she sat down and cried with joy. For days after, whenever we had occasion to enter the kitchen, we were pretty sure to hear the sharp snap of the work-box lid as she closed it; and from the day it first came into her possession, there was a slow, strange, but sure improvement in Cinderella's appearance. No doubt it was occasionally the repository of hard bake, candy, toffy; but then it also contained her glass necklace and string of bugles, which she threw round her neck (and wore as proudly as a countess would her diamonds), when she went to visit her mother in *her* court. It contained also a penny bottle of "real oil of roses" for her hair; this we ascertained through her having broken it, and inquiring what would take grease out of the much-admired pink cotton lining of her treasured box; a disaster that caused her to shed "a few natural tears." After this she took to letting her hair grow long behind, and in a few weeks we saw a little morsel, bound with ribbon, sticking out like the tail of a sparrow; she also put her front hair in paper, but this plan we suppose she abandoned, for we noticed on the following day that there was about as much curl in it as in the kitchen poker. For a long time, after a few of these failures, she gave up buying curl-paper, and used more freely her favourite delusion—"oil of roses." She made some kind of flounces to one of her cotton frocks; but, as we heard her telling the Cinderella next door, it made her dress too short, so she let it out until she got her new boots, then she should take it up again to show them. Her boots will have the gaudiest coloured tops she can find, and they will burst out at the sides in no time, for she will have them narrow at the toes, as she has heard "that small feet is fashionable."

Many, perhaps, would have seen only her faults, and kept up an incessant carping that would have rendered her poor life miserable; many, perhaps, who might have had children of their own, and, but for more fortunate circumstances, would have been some other body's Cinderella. Though it was not pleasant to find her rough unmistakable hair clinging to our own brush, we endured the annoyance once or twice till we could supply her with a cheap hair-brush; for such peccadilloes showed that she had a wish to improve her appearance—to advance instead of falling back; and the thought of discharging her never entered our head. Though the little cuffs she made for herself only served to render the dirt on her wrists more visible, this was not long the case; for the same taste that led her to aspire to a better style of dress, caused her to become more cleanly in her person. As she advanced in collars and cuffs, so she abandoned purchasing penny crabs, eating pickled eels in the streets, and drinking sun-heated ginger-beer; nor were there any longer signs of shell-fish in the salt-bin. That look of slovenliness about the feet was gone; her boot-laces were neatly fastened, instead of dangling like snares about her feet, that threatened every moment to overthrow her. She now took more heed of her steps. I heard the baker's new man, not many weeks ago, call her "Miss" as he delivered the bread; and though in my eye he looked a cunning artful rascal, who would not keep his place long—which has since proved true—yet Cinderella cannot for a moment believe that it was he who gave her the bad sixpence, although it was the only sixpence she took that day in change. I dare say she was too busily engaged with the compliment he paid her, to think of looking after her change. I sometimes fancy, when I see an intelligent light breaking through her good-natured countenance, and beaming out of her bright earnest eyes, that a new spirit has taken its abode in her not ungraceful body, and that many of those old, shrewd, selfish feelings are dead, which lived within her when she breathed only the foul air of the corrupt and corrupting court.

And now she no longer slams to the kitchen-door with a haughty toss of the head, and a "Well, I'm sure it's like your impercence," when the young butcher calls; but if it is only a pound of chops she orders, she allows him to bring it home; and when he has nothing else to leave, he is continually bringing in something or other for the cat. She thinks he is one of the finest horsemen in the world; for when he rides by with his basket, and sees her either at the door or window, he is sure to start off at a "butcher's gallop." She has bought a shilling tea-tray, in the centre of which is something intended for a parrot, with a couple of cherries in its beak. It is the pride of her heart; and after having dusted it, which she does several times a day, she will stand with her head aside admiring it, for she thinks it "so much like nature." Let us leave her to the worshipping of her few misshapen household gods; perhaps through her little temple—the kitchen—she sees down the long dim vista a far away home of her own, to which hope often points. In time she will show all her treasured purchases to the young butcher, for we have more than once stumbled upon him in the kitchen; and the first time she blushed, and said in a trembling voice, "Please, it's only William," as if we had not known him for the last five years; and he, touching the brightest and largest portion of his sueted hair, muttered something about "keeping company," though it needed no confession, for we found it out long ago that he was "head over ears" in love with Our Cinderella. We have frequently heard her singing over her work of late—

"Wilt thou love me then as now."

which shows that she is thinking over her "intended change" very seriously. — *Chambers's Journal.*

HUMAN GULLIBILITY.

This quality of human nature appears to be infinite. It has no bottom and no boundaries. The immortal hero of Cervantes is no exceptional man, but a good type of the race. Some people, it is true, have, upon some subjects, a horror of being gulled individually, but they submit to it, nay, demand it, collectively. Where there is a demand, there will be a supply. As soon as men who have a genius for invention find that cases like those of Ananias and Sapphira are too rare to be distressed about, they take all sorts of liberties with truth, not perhaps so much because they hate that homely divinity, as because lying pays. Truth, perhaps they think with Charles Lamb, is too precious to be wasted on the people they have to deal with, at all events it is not what they want or would be thankful for. This lying is a bad business in the long run unquestionably, but how shall it be rooted out of the universe while there is such an appetite to believe, an appetite which all the truth that has room to exist in time and space cannot satisfy or appease?

Here is your Don Quixote, armed, mounted on his famous Rosinante, hungering and thirsting for adventure. Truth has none for him. Reality is flat and sterile. Shall not some wag of a Duchess, blessed with a bright imagination make work for him? It is too cruel to leave him always to the necessity of deceiving himself. His immortal longings will never be satisfied till he is splendidly imposed upon by somebody else.

So here are whole masses, nations of men, who cannot be satisfied till they are stuffed. It makes little odds what you stuff them with, provided it is something that will stretch the believing power a little. A little natural aliment they must have of course, but besides that they want their crops distended with lobster salad, mince pie, lignum vitæ chips and tenpenny nails. You pity them after they have swallowed such things? Don't waste your compassion. They are now perfectly happy. Their undefinable intolerable sense of vacuity is no more. They are delivered from the awful suspense of doubt. They now *know* something and *are* somebody.

The human herd, stuffed to the lips with the absurdities on which their feeders feed them, sometimes amuse themselves with stuffing a weak brother, who has a special gullibility, or appetite for believing on his own personal account. Things of this sort are sometimes done which would seem impossible to one who had not studied human nature in this point of view. There is well known in this community an inoffensive person by the name of Geo. W. F. Mellen, who, having the sense to see that if a slave were to be brought before any magistrate on a writ of *habeas corpus*—which our constitutions all make a parade of guaranteeing to everybody—it would be the duty of the magistrate to set him free, thinks he has discovered in the said *habeas corpus* a remedy for slavery. All he has to do is to convince the judges of their duty and bring the slaves before them. To get this idea afloat he has spent his time and substance, spoke and printed. Any time these fifteen years past he has attended every public meeting in relation to slavery, and always been ready and more than willing to speak a word for *habeas corpus*. The meeting however have been less patient than he has been willing.

This reluctance of Abolitionists of every stripe to hear the soundest and most self-evident Abolition doctrine, has always been a mystery to Mr. Mellen. It has sorely exercised his patience, nevertheless he has persevered. Of late years, however, he seems to have come to the conclusion that it would be necessary for him, in order to give practical effect to his doctrine, to become a United States Senator or President of the United States. He has probably hinted as much in the hearing of those who relish individual stuffing as a good practical joke. Accordingly, a very formal meeting was got up in Cochituate Hall, at which, amidst volleys of fun, Mr. Mellen was nominated for the Presidency, Mr. Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, being put on the ticket with him as Vice President, to keep up the delusion, while he was gagged out of his *habeas corpus* speech on the occasion by a *five minute* law most rigorously enforced. At Lynn, the nomination was repeated with greater ceremony and broader fun. An insane habitue of these parts was put by the side of Mellen, between whose claims for the Presidency and Mellen's the meeting was to decide. The two were conveyed all about town during the afternoon in a barouche with six of the worst possibly assorted horses. At the hall, which was densely thronged in the evening, they were received upon a stage, upholstered in a strange way for the purposes of a pretended secret order, that of the Rabbits. Mounted on a railway which traversed the stage was the carcase of a porker of the greatest obesity and the amplest dimensions. Astride of this whole swine the rival candidates were successively placed and ridden across the stage repeatedly amidst the shouts of more than a thousand delighted spectators. Pledges of a ridiculous character were administered and taken, and resolutions of the same sort were passed, urged on by speeches of the broadest burlesque. The assembly declared for Mellen. He swallows all, accepts with an explanation of the breadth of his American principles which is creditable to his philanthropy, and himself spreads the doings of the two meetings above described before the world in a paper of his own called the *Habeas Corpus*.

Feeling our coat pulled in the street the other day, we turned and beheld this Mr. Mellen with his hands full of the *Habeas Corpus*. He began at once to apologize for not having joined his team with ours. He would have done so if he had known that we were going to get out the *Fireside Journal*. We have no doubt he would. "But what do you think of this nomination?" he asked. "What nomination?" "Why, hav'nt you heard of the meeting at Cochituate Hall? I mean our nomination. They have nominated me and Cassius M. Clay for the Presidency." "Ah, I remember I did see it, and a meeting at Lynn also. Since you ask it, I think, Mr. Mellen, they are making a fool of you." "Oh no; you don't understand it at all. I have been assured by the most respectable men"—he named several—"they really mean it." We spent some minutes endeavouring to convince Mr. Mellen that he had been grossly imposed upon, but probably only excited his wonder and pity that we should throw away so good a chance of being Secretary of State or something of that sort, under his administration, for his kind remark about joining teams with us, seemed to imply that we might have looked for a place in his cabinet.—*(Boston) Fireside Journal.*

THE BIRDS OF SPRING.

BY WASHINGTON IRVING.

My quiet residence in the country, aloof from fashion, politics, and the money market, leaves me rather at a loss for occupation, and drives me occasionally to the study of nature, and other low pursuits. Having few neighbours, on whom to keep a watch and exercise my habits of observation, I fain to amuse myself with prying into the domestic concerns and peculiarities of the animals around me, and, during the present season, have derived considerable entertainment from certain sociable little birds, almost the only visitors we have during this early part of the year.

Those who have passed the winter in the country are sensible of the delightful influences that accompany the earliest indications of spring; and of these, none are more delightful than the first notes of the bird. There is one modest little sad-coloured bird, much resembling a wren, which came about the house just on the skirts of winter, when not a blade of grass was to be seen, and when a few prematurely warm days had given a flattering foretaste of soft weather. He sang early in the dawning, long before sunrise, and late in the evening, just before the closing in of night, his matin and his vesper hymns. It is true, he sang occasionally throughout the day; but at these still hours, his song was more remarked. He sat on a leafless tree, just before the window, and warbled forth his notes, few and simple, but singularly sweet, with something of a plaintive tone that heightened their effect.

The first morning that he was heard was a joyous one among the young folks of my household. The long, death-like sleep of winter was at an end; nature was once more awakening; they now promised themselves the immediate appearance of buds and blossoms. I was reminded of the tempest-tossed crew of Columbus, when, after their long dubious voyage, the field-birds came singing round the ship, though still far at sea, rejoicing them with the belief of the immediate proximity of land. A sharp return of winter almost silenced my little songster, and dashed the hilarity of the household; yet still he poured forth, now and then, a few plaintive notes, between the frosty pipings of the breeze, like gleams of sunshine between wintry clouds.

I have consulted my books of ornithology in vain to find out the name of this kindly little bird, who certainly deserves honour and favour far beyond his modest pretensions. He comes like the lowly violet, the most unpretending, but welcomest, of flowers, breathing the sweet promises of the early year.

Another of our feathered visitors, who follows close upon the steps of winter, is the Pewit, or Peewee, or Phœbe-bird, for he is called by each of these names, from a fancied resemblance to the sound of his monotonous note. He is a social little being, and seeks the habitation of men. A pair of them have built beneath my porch, and have reared several broods there for two years past, their nest never being disturbed. They arrive early in the spring, just when the crocus and snowdrop begin to peep forth. Their first chirp spreads gladness through the house. The "Phœbe-birds have come!" is heard on all sides. They are welcomed back like members of the family, and speculations are made upon where they have been during their long absence. Their arrival is the more cheering as it is announced by the old weather-wise people of the country, the sure sign that the severe frosts are at an end, and that the gardener may resume his labours with confidence.

About this time, too, arrives the Blue-bird, so poetically yet truly described by Wilson. His appearance gladdens the whole landscape. He sociably approaches your habitation, and takes up his residence in your vicinity.

The happiest bird of our spring, however, and one that rivals the European lark in my estimation, is the Boblincoln, or Boblink, as he is commonly called. He arrives at that choice portion of our year which, in this latitude, answers to the description of the month of May so often given by the poets. With us it begins about the middle of May, and lasts until nearly the middle of June. Earlier than this, winter is apt to return on its traces, and to blight the opening beauties of the year, and later than this begin the parching, and panting, and dissolving heats of summer. But in this genial interval nature is in all her freshness and fragrance. "The rains are over and gone, the flowers appear upon the earth, the time of singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in the land." The trees are now in their fullest foliage and brightest verdure; the woods are gay with the clustered flowers of the laurel; the air is perfumed by the sweet briar and the wild rose; the meadows are enameled with clover blossoms; while the young apple, the peach and the plum begin to swell, and the cherry to glow among the green leaves.

This is the chosen season of revelry of the Boblink. He comes amidst the pomp and fragrance of the season; his life seems all sensibility and enjoyment, all song and sunshine. He is to be found in the soft bosoms of the freshest and sweetest meadows, and is most in song when the clover is in blossom. He perches on the topmost twig of a tree, or on some long flaunting weed, and, as he rises and sinks with the breeze, pours forth a succession of rich twinkling notes, crowding one upon another, like the outpouring melody of the skylark, and possessing the same rapturous character. Sometimes he pitches from the summit of a tree, begins his song as soon as he gets upon the wing, and flutters tremulously down to the earth, as if overcome with ecstacy at his own music. Sometimes he is in pursuit of his paramour, always in full song, as if he would win her by his melody, and always with the same appearance of intoxication and delight.

Of all the birds of our groves and meadows, the Boblink was the envy of my boyhood. He crossed my path in the sweetest weather, and sweetest season of the year, when all nature called to the field, and the rural feelings throbbed in every bosom; but when I, luckless urchin! was doomed to be mewed up, during the livelong day, in that purgatory of boyhood, a school-room, it seemed as if the varlet mocked at me, as he flew by in full song, and sought to taunt me with his happy lot. Oh, how I envied him! No lessons, no task, no hateful school, nothing but holiday, frolic, green fields, and fine weather. Had I then been more versed in poetry, I might have addressed him in the words of Logan to the cuckoo:

> Sweet bird! thy bower is ever green,
> Thy sky is ever clear;
> Thou hast no sorrow in thy note,
> No winter in thy year.
>
> Oh! could I fly, I'd fly with thee;
> We'd make, on joyful wing,
> Our annual visits round the globe,
> Companions of the Spring!

Further observation and experience have given me a different idea of this little feathered voluptuary, which I will venture to impart for the benefit of my school-boy readers who may regard him with the same unqualified envy and admiration which I once indulged. I have shown him only as I saw him first, in what I may call the poetical part of his career, when he in a manner devoted himself to elegant pursuits and enjoyments, and was a bird of music, and song, and taste, and sensibility, and refinement. While this lasted, he was sacred from injury; the very school-boy would not fling a stone at him, and the merest rustic would pause to listen to his strain. But mark the difference. As the year advances, as the clover blossoms disappear, and the spring fades into summer, he gradually gives up his elegant tastes and habits; doffs his poetical suit of black, assumes a russet dusty garb, and sinks to the gross enjoyments of common vulgar birds. His notes no longer vibrate on the ear; he is stuffing himself with the seeds of the tall weeds on which he lately swung and chanted so melodiously. He has become a "*bon vivant*," a "gourmand"; with him now there is nothing like the "joys of the table." In a little while he grows tired of plain, homely fare, and is off on a gastronomical tour in quest of foreign luxuries. We next hear of him, with myriads of his kind, banqueting among the reeds of the Delaware, and grown corpulent with good feeding. He has changed his name in travelling. Boblincoln no more—he is the *Reed-bird* now; the much-sought-for tit-bit of Pennsylvania epicures; the rival in unlucky fame of the ortolan! Wherever he goes, pop! pop! pop! every rusty fire-lock in the country is blazing away. He sees his companions falling by thousands around him.

Does he take warning and reform? Alas, not he! Incorrigible epicure! Again he wings his flight. The rice swamps of the South invite him. He gorges himself among them, almost bursting; he can scarcely fly for corpulency. He has once more changed his name, and is now the famous *Rice-bird* of the Carolinas.

Last stage of his career; behold him spitted with dozens of his companions, and served up, a vaunted dish, on the table of some southern gastronomer.

Such is the story of the Boblink, once spiritual, musical, admired, the joy of the meadows, and the favourite bird of spring; finally, a gross little sensualist, who expiates his sensuality in the larder. His story contains a moral worthy the attention of all little birds and little boys; warning them to keep to those refined and intellectual pursuits which raised him to so high a pitch of popularity, during the early part of his career; but to eschew all tendency of that gross and dissipated indulgence which brought this mistaken bird to an untimely end.

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY—THE OSTEND AFFAIR.

From the London Morning Times, March 24.

The diplomacy of the United States of America is certainly a very singular profession. It combines with the utmost publicity the habitual pursuit of dishonourable objects by clandestine means, and, while it professes to rest, like all the institutions of the American people, on the maxim of Washington, it descends to practices which Washington would have dealt with as he dealt with those of M. Genet and Major Andre. For certain purposes, the diplomatic agents of the United States are not ashamed deliberately to conspire, with a view, of course, to their national aggrandizement and their personal advantage. But they conspire publicly; they lay before Congress, and Congress prints for the benefit of mankind, their solemn proofs and declarations that they have conspired, are conspiring, and will conspire; insomuch that intentions which would set all Europe in a blaze if they were avowed by a member of the elder family of nations, and which would justify a declaration of war if they were seriously entertained by the American Government, are manifested with perfect impunity by the agents and representatives of that Government on foreign missions.

There was a time when American diplomacy was regarded as a plain, homespun, wholesome sort of service, which was held up to the imitation of this country by politicians of the school of Mr. Grote or the late Joseph Hume. American ministers were supposed to be wholly removed from the artifices of courts and the subtleties of diplomatic intercourse. Their instructions were to abstain from all those acts of interference which cause nine-tenths of the troubles of mankind—to maintain their own dignity without encroaching on the rights of others, and to rely on the governing strength and prosperity of the American people to secure for them the station they deserve among the States of the world. These simple maxims are, however, very much out of date. The representatives of the Government of President Pierce and his immediate predecessors have brought with them to Europe a different assortment of notions; and no later than last Autumn a regular Conference was held by these gentlemen in one of the towns of Belgium to discuss and determine questions, which, if they could be seriously regarded, might threaten the peace of the other hemisphere. This meeting was attended by Mr. Buchanan, the American Minister in London; by Mr. Mason, from Paris, and by Mr. Soulé, from Madrid; and the chief topic under the consideration of these plenipotentiaries was the acquisition of Cuba. The dispatch in which they communicated to the Cabinet of Washington the result of their deliberations was dated from Aix-la-Chapelle, the 18th of October, 1854; and it contains the following extraordinary passage, which appears to us to deserve the utmost publicity, especially as two of the gentlemen who signed it are still accredited to the Courts of England and France:

"After we have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question—Does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then, by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain, if we have the power; and this upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbour, if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home.

"Under such circumstances, we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us. We forbear to enter into the question whether the present condition of the island would justify such a measure. We should, however, be recreant to our duty, be unworthy of our gallant forefathers, and commit base treason against our posterity, should we permit Cuba to be Africanized and become a second St. Domingo, with all its attendant horrors to the whole race, and suffer the flames to extend to our own neighbouring shores, seriously to endanger, or actually to consume, the fair fabric of our Union."

According to this doctrine, it is obvious that no such thing as political right can exist in the world; for the test applied to the condition of a foreign dependency is not whether the actual possessor is entitled to hold a thing, but whether it suits the convenience of anybody else to take it from him. It is an application of M. Louis Blanc's theory to the rights of nations, when he decreed from the Luxembourg that the wages of mankind ought to be regulated, not by their earnings, but by their wants. If my peace of mind is destroyed because my neighbour overlooks my garden—if my pretensions to success in life are opposed by a successful rival—or if, in short, anything occurs to infringe upon the golden rule of self, "then, by every law, human and divine," according to these modern interpreters of justice and policy, we are justified in wresting the object of our aversion or our cupidity from its owner, if we have the power. The old definition of justice and the rights of property was, "*Sic utere two ut alienum non lædas*;" but the modern instance of this ancient saw is, "Use other men's possessions so as to prevent them from injuring yourself." We really exaggerate nothing; irony and caricature would be out of place. This is the deliberate opinion of the three principal Americans chosen and sent by the Government of Washington to represent its principles and to uphold its character in Europe, and we are bound to suppose that they represent at least some considerable class of opinions in the United States.

If the existence of Cuba as a Spanish Colony can in any way affect the internal peace and union of the American Republics—above all, if the principles of emancipation, of independence, and of human freedom from the bondage of the planter and the scourge of slavery were ever to strike root in that soil, watered as it is with the blood of so many millions of negroes, then, indeed, the duties of these American patriots would become imperative, and they must hasten to impose on the inhabitants of Cuba a yoke far more onerous as far as the black population is concerned, than of Catholic and Monarchical Spain. So that the greater the progress of the island, and the more it becomes assimilated to the free West India Colonies of this country, the greater would be the inducement to these American statesmen to extend their territories by invasion and by conquest. That is precisely the argument by which the Czars of Russia justified their interference in Poland in the last century, and their aggressions on Turkey in our own time—self-interest disguised under the plea of self-defence—imaginary dangers conjured up to palliate real injustice—a wrong to another described as a duty to posterity. These are the old sophisms by which attempts have ever been made to bring the excesses of rapacity and ambition within the code of international morality. They are, in truth, no better than gross and palpable lies; they deceive no one, not even those by whom they are uttered; and we can conceive nothing more worthy of a free people than to repudiate with the indignation they deserve these maxims, which are fatal to the true dignity of the United States, because they are dishonest and untrue. Whatever may be the fate of Cuba, there is no reason that any change in its social condition (if, indeed, any such change is likely to take place) should produce more powerful effects on the United States than the loss of St. Domingo by France, or the emancipation of the blacks of Jamaica by England. To carry out the detestable principle now avowed, it would be necessary for the United States to absorb, one by one, the islands which stud the Caribbean Sea, to strip them of the privileges of free men, which we have bestowed on their black inhabitants, and to reduce them once more to be an Archipelago of slaves. Do the American diplomats who hold this language suppose that the internal peace and existence of their justly cherished Union are to be bought at such a price? They are strangely mistaken. The conflict with Spain which their designs on Cuba must occasion, the coolness with France and England to which it would give rise, the horrible scenes which must take place in the island itself before the black population could be reduced to absolute and passive obedience to the American laws, are not the greatest perils which this policy would call into life. Far from being a cause of union and strength to the people of America, we are satisfied that a war begun for so atrocious an object, defended by such arguments as these, and tending to such fatal results, would be opposed by no inconsiderable part of the States. The freemen of America would ask how long they are to endure the opprobrium and participate in the guilt of the slaveholders and the slave States, whose simplest notions of morality and duty are tainted by the institution under which they live; the hardy States of the North would not send down their forces to rivet fetters on the slaves of Cuba, and to place in the Senate of the Union the representatives of another slaveholding community; and the reaction would extend with alarming violence against the interests of the slave-owners in the South. By the nature of things, that conflict would be fought out not on the soil of Cuba—the battle must be lost or won in the heart of the United States.

We trust that, in spite of the extravagant conduct of many of the diplomatic agents named by Mr. Pierce, their power is limited and their influence on the decline. The late Congress has terminated its labours and its existence, and another assembly, elected under a new order of opinions, has succeeded to it. The members of this body are untried men, and the principles of what is termed the "Know-Nothing party," have not yet been seen in action; but, so far as we are acquainted with them, we refer them to the schemes of those demagogues who sought to supply their own internal weakness by foreign agitation; and we are not without hopes that the good sense of the nation may continue to hold in check the folly and violence of its rulers.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

An autograph letter of George Washington was sold at auction in London for £5.

——Louis Kossuth announces, by advertisement, that he has formed a permanent engagement with the London *Atlas*, and solicits subscriptions for that (weekly) paper.

——The subjoined advertisement is taken from an Irish newspaper: "Missing from Killarney, Jane O'Fogarty, she had in her arms two babies and a Guernsey cow, all black, with red hair and tortoiseshell combs behind her ears, and large spots all down her back, which squints awfully."

——Mr. T. C. Simon, in a volume entitled *Scientific Certainties of Planetary Life*, sides with Sir D. Brewster against Dr. Whewell, in maintaining the probability of the theory that the planets are inhabited. He does this, however, by a new and ingenious argument, in which he contends that the stars as well as the planets, have opaque planetary systems like ours. Inasmuch as the question has disturbed the faith of many, it is desirable to have it well discussed; and nowhere has it been more powerfully handled than by Mr. Simon.

——Perhaps the oldest tree on record is the Cypress of Somma, in Lombardy. It is supposed to have been planted in the year of the birth of Christ, and on that account is looked on with reverence by the inhabitants: but an ancient chronicle at Milan is said to prove that it was a tree at the time of Julius Cæsar, B. C. 40. It is 123 feet high, and twenty feet in circumference at one foot from the ground. Napoleon, when laying down the plan of his great road over the Simplon, diverged from a straight line to avoid injuring the tree.

——The only member of the ex-Royal family of France who displayed anything like energy on the 24th of February, 1848, was the aged and venerable Queen. She it was, it now seems, who, when things were rapidly coming to a crisis, compelled M. Guizot and his colleagues to resign—a step which if taken in due time might have stayed the revolutionary tempest. "Your continued presence in power, gentlemen," said she, "endangers the throne, and I invite you to resign!" It was her Majesty, too, who compelled Louis Philippe to mount his horse and show himself to the troops and National Guard; and it was she who combated the proposition that he should abdicate. It was she, also, who, when flight became necessary, led off the poor old king leaning on her arm.

——A London Earthquake.—In 1842, an absurd report gained credence among the weak-minded, that London would be destroyed by earthquake on the 17th March, St. Patrick's-day. This rumour was founded on certain doggrel prophecies: one pretended to be pronounced in the year 1203, and contained in Harleian Collection (British Museum), 800 b. folio 319; the other by Dr. Dee, the astrologer (1598, MS. in the British Museum). The rhymes, with these "authorities," inserted in the newspapers, actually excited some alarm, and a great number of timid persons left the metropolis before the 17th. Upon reference to the British Museum, the "prophecies" were not, however, to be found; and their forger has confessed them to have been an experiment upon public credulity.

——A Home-Thrust.—The *Manchester* (Eng.) *Times*, in an article on the War says pertinently enough: "If they who clamour for war, who almost always consider it, when their own country is engaged in it, to be righteous or unavoidable, or who uniformly entertain some Utopian idea of its results, would themselves encounter its perils or devote themselves to the accomplishment of the glorious advantages which they expect it is to confer on humanity, we would be inclined at least to admire their self-sacrifice and the practical evidence which they afforded of the sincerity of their convictions, and the importance which they attach to their opinions. But when we hear landowners, merchants and divines, or any of the classes who sit in luxurious ease at home, and who do not lose a single comfort by war, glibly declaiming about 'the justice and necessity of the present war,' we are sometimes tempted to wish that they had the opportunity of looking at it for a little through the medium of the sufferings of the Crimea, or even of the miseries of the industrious poor in our own country."

——A Rare Politician.—Mr. Layard, in a recent speech to his constituents, made the following statement, which, had it been made by an American politician, would have been deemed sufficient cause by his friends, for shutting him up in a lunatic asylum. And, stranger still, the audience applauded the man who was not willing to accept office, merely because he was unfit for it!

"Last Monday week, a few hours before he made his speech in the House, which some of them might have seen, Lord Palmerston offered him the clerkship of the Ordnance. Having joined in the vote of want of confidence in the late Government, he felt, firstly, he could not accept office under men who had formed part of that Government; and, secondly, he had always thought it the duty of the Government to put the right man in the right place (hear, hear). Now, he was not acquainted with the duties of the Ordnance, and he would have been betraying his own principles if he had accepted that appointment (applause). Lord Palmerston sent for him, and told him that, at Lord John Russell's request, he would offer to him the office of Under-Secretary for the Colonies. He then felt himself in the same position as he had been before, when offered the office in the Board of Control. He would have been false to his constituents, false to his country and false to himself (cheers)."

——An Anecdote of Miss Nightingale.—One hundred and fifty-two invalids arrived at Chatham on Saturday, from the Crimea. Many of the cavalry soldiers show the effect of severe sabre wounds, received at the grand charge at Balaklava. They all speak in the very highest and grrteful terms of Miss Nightingale, and relate an anecdote of that good lady, as they name her, which saved the lives of many of them. A considerable quantity of invalids arrived at Scutari from the Crimea in a very bad state, and bedding and other articles were demanded from the person known as storekeeper, who, when applied to for the articles, refused to deliver them without a written order from the head of his department. Miss Nightingale, seeing the emergency of the case, and the necessity of immediate attention to the invalids, offered to make good the articles required if they were disallowed. The storekeeper would not yield, although Miss Nightingale said, if he was so exact, many of the men would be dead before the order could arrive. Miss Nightingale, finding anything she could say to the storekeeper of no avail, left him, and addressed herself to a few of the stoutest of the men to break open the door of the store, which they soon effected, and with her own hands she served out what was required, telling the storekeeper, who was looking on with the key in his hand, that she alone was responsible for what had been done.

——Southey's Religion.—Gibbon shook my belief in Christianity when I was a school-boy of seventeen. When I went to college it was in the height of the French Revolution—and I drank deeply of that cup. I had a friend there whose name you have seen in my poems—Edmund Seward, an admirable man in all things, whose only fault was that he was too humble; for humble, even to a fault, he was. In his company my religious interests were strengthened. But to those who have any religious feeling, you need not be told how chilling and withering the lip-service of a university must be. Sick of the college, chapel and church, we tried the meeting-house; and there we were disgusted too. Coleridge came from Cambridge to visit a friend at Oxford on his way to a journey in Wales. That friend was my bosom companion: Coleridge was brought to my rooms—and that meeting fixed the future fortunes of us both. Our meeting was mutually agreeable; I reformed his life, and he disposed me towards Christianity. He remained three or four weeks at Oxford, and we planned an Utopia of our own, to be founded in the wilds of America upon the basis of common property—each labouring for all—a Pantisocracy—a republic of Reason and Virtue. For this dream I gave up every prospect. How painfully and slowly I was awakened from it this is not the time to say. In what has all this ended? you will ask. That I am still what in old times was called a *seeker*—a sheep without a fold, but not without a shepherd; clinging to all that Christ has clearly taught, but shrinking from all attempts at defending, by articles of faith, those points which the Gospels have left indefinite. I am of no visible church, but assuredly I feel myself in the communion of saints.—*Letter to Montgomery.*

——An old Literary Coffee-House.—The Chapter Coffee-House, 50, Paternoster-row, is mentioned in No. 1 of the *Connoisseur*, Jan. 31, 1754, as the resort of "those encouragers of literature, and not the worst judges of merit, the booksellers." Chatterton dates several letters from the *Chapter*. The late Alexander Stephens left some reminiscences of the literati and politicians who frequented the Chapter from 1797 to 1805. The box in the north-east corner was called the *Witenagemot*, and was occupied by the "Wet-Paper Club." Here assembled Dr. Buchan, author of "Domestic Medicine"; Dr. Berdmore, Master of the Charter-house; Walker, the rhetorician; and Dr. Towers, the political writer; Dr. George Fordyce, and Dr. Gower of "the Middlesex," who, with Buchan, prescribed the Chapter punch; Robinson, King of the Booksellers; and his brother John; Joseph Johnson, the friend of Priestley and Paine, and Cowper and Fuseli; Alexander Chalmers, the workman of the Rob